



HARVARD THEOLOGICAL REVIEW

VOLUME XIII

OCTOBER, 1920

NUMBER 4

THE EARLIEST MINOR ACCOUNTS OF PLYMOUTH PLANTATION

CHAMPLIN BURRAGE

CAMBRIDGE

The story of the voyage of the Mayflower in 1620 and of the Pilgrim settlement at Plymouth has been told again and again, and in this year of the tercentenary celebration will be repeated in still further varying forms; but we are certain that it will never be more graphically narrated than by the Pilgrims themselves and their friends during the twenties, thirties, and forties of the seventeenth century.

In this paper I do not intend to venture to give any new version of that narrative. It is my purpose rather to recall certain phases of the story as they appear in the vigorous and terse English of the earliest accounts, and to note especially also the interesting archæological information concerning the Indians of New England which they furnish.

In recent years Governor Bradford's monumental *History of Plimoth Plantation* has overshadowed these minor accounts, and this is quite understandable, owing to its undoubted value, its comparatively recent recovery, and its publication in several editions. It would, however, be a mistake to suppose that the *History* has superseded the more fragmentary literature. Quite the contrary is the case, for that work was only commenced in 1630 and was

written with an entirely different purpose in view. Consequently it lacks much of the freshness and detail of the first contemporary narratives, though it also occasionally supplements them with other facts of considerable interest. Sometimes, however, Bradford in the *History* abbreviates, alters, or even passes over in silence incidents or details which at the time of the arrival of the Pilgrims seemed interesting, if not important.

In reintroducing the subject of the early Pilgrim literature I shall consider almost entirely certain documents published in 1622 under the title of *A Relation or Iovrnall*, and Edward Winslow's *Good Newes from New England* issued in 1624. Brief reference will also be made to John Pory's *Description of Plymouth Colony* of 1622, to Captain John Smith's *Advertisements* of 1631, to William Wood's [Sir William Alexander's?] *New Englands Prospect* of 1636, and to Thomas Morton's *New English Canaan* of 1637.

It may be doubted if there is any early document relating to the Pilgrims equal in vivacity and graphic power to John Pory's *Description* of 1622. Pory was a friend of Governor Bradford and one of the best letter-writers of his time; and his quaint and delightful account of Plymouth gives a picture of the infant colony and its neighborhood and of the life there in those early days such as no other known writer of the period has left behind. An occasional touch of humor adds to its readability. The document as a whole furnishes us with the earliest description of Plymouth of any extent which still exists in a contemporary manuscript, and with information on various historical points little or not otherwise known, and clears up one matter which has proved a puzzle to historians and editors for two and a half centuries.¹

¹ I refer to the word Angoum or Anguam, which is here shown to stand for Anquam (Annisquam) on Cape Ann, and not for Agawam (Ipswich), as heretofore supposed.

As Pory's narrative has recently been published in full,² the following extract will suffice here, and will give some idea of the breezy manner in which this debonair adventurer noted his impressions of the new colony and its neighborhood:

"Oysters there are none, but at Massachusett some 20 miles to the north of this place there are such huge ones by salvages report, as I am loth to report. For ordinarie ones, of which there be manie, they make to be as broad as a bushell, but one among the rest they compared to the greate cabbin of the Discoverie, and being sober and well advised persons, grew verie angrie when they were laughed at or not beleaved! I would haue had Captaine Jones to haue tried out the truth of this report, and what was the reason? If, said I, the oysters be soe greate and haue anie pearles in them, then must the pearles be answerable in greatnes to the oysters, and proving round and orient also, would farre exceed all other jewells in the world! Yea, what strange and pretious things might be found in so rare a creature! But Captaine Jones his imploying his pinnace in discoveries, his graueing of the ship, his hast away about other occasions and busines, would not permit him to doe that which often since he wished he could haue done."

The earliest experiences of the Pilgrim Fathers after their eventful voyage across the Atlantic are first recorded in the previously mentioned *Relation or Iovrnall*, 1622, and Edward Winslow's *Good Newes from New England*, 1624. In America for many years the *Relation or Iovrnall* has been erroneously styled *Mourt's Relation*. Dr. Henry Martyn Dexter was, no doubt, chiefly responsible for perpetuating the title, but recent writers occasionally employ it, in spite of the fact that for more than fifty years scholars have justly suspected and stated, though without perfectly satisfactory evidence in the first instance, that Governor William Bradford and Edward Winslow were the true authors respectively of the two separate Relations really included in that work. Until the publication of Professor Edward Arber's *Story*

² Houghton Mifflin Co., 1918.

of the *Pilgrim Fathers* in 1897, indeed, definite proof was wanting to show that Bradford had ever written such a *Relation*. Twenty years and more, however, have gone by since then, and yet our historians and editors are still referring to *Mourt's Relation*.

On pages 506 and 507 of Arber's *Story of the Pilgrim Fathers* will be found the following complaint, of the date 1622,³ the contents of which when taken in connection with certain well known facts prove that the first (and only real) *Relation* published concerning the Pilgrims in 1622 was written by Bradford, and that there is no reason whatever for attaching to it the name of an unknown person of the period called "Mourt":⁴

"THE COMPLAINT OF CERTAIN ADVENTURERS AND INHABITANTS
OF THE PLANTATION IN NEW ENGLAND

Sheweth

That a ship belonging to them, named the *Fortune*, of the burden of between 40 and 50 tons or thereabouts, being upon their way homeward, and near the English coast, some eight leagues off Use, called by the Frenchmen Ile d'Use [= Yeu, off the coast of Poitou], was, the 19th of January last [1622], assailed and taken by a French Man-of-War, the Captain whereof was called FONTENAU DE PENNART *de Britannie* [*Bretagne*]; and carried to the Isle of Use.

³ Mr. Worthington C. Ford reproduces this document in full in his *Massachusetts Historical Society* edition of Bradford's *History* (I, 268, 269), but fails to draw the obvious conclusion, and (I, 177, note 6) speaks of "Mourt" and of the "authors of the *Relation*."

⁴ Consequently, a historical blunder has been made in calling this work *Mourt's Relation*. In the first place, Mourt is a ghost-name, since it never existed except by mistake. In the original printed edition the name stands as "Mourt.", the period at the end naturally indicating an abbreviation by suspension, as well as the conclusion of the preface. The name "Mourton," "Murton," or "Morton" (compare the similar phonetic spellings Crumwell and Cromwell) is manifestly intended, but there is nothing to prove that George Morton wrote much more than the preface. In the second place, according to the printed title-page, the work known as *Mourt's Relation* contains not one *Relation* but two *Relations*, the second chiefly composed, it would appear, of letters or parts of letters written by Edward Winslow. In the third place, we have the best of reasons, both from internal evidence and from the definite statement in the complaint just mentioned, that the first *Relation* was written by Governor Bradford, or perhaps we might say more accurately, was compiled by him from his own observations and possibly the narrative of some eye-witness of occasional events not noted by himself.

That FONTENAU presented the ship, and company thereof, being 13 persons, as prisoners to Monsieur le Marquis DE CERA, Governor of the Isle. . . . That thereupon Monsieur DE CERA kept THOMAS BARTON, Master of the ship, seven days, close prisoner in his Castle, and the rest of the company under guard; and commanded his soldiers to pillage them. . . . That he sent for all their letters, [and] opened and kept what he pleased; especially, though he was much intreated to the contrary, a letter written by [WILLIAM BRADFORD] the Governor of our Colony in New England, containing a general Relation of all matters there.”⁵

Accordingly, we know definitely that about 1621–22, Bradford did write “a general Relation of all matters” pertaining to the colony at Plymouth; that it was carried to Europe in the *Fortune*, which on January 19–29, 1621–22, was captured by a French war vessel and taken to the Isle of Yeu, off the coast of Poitou; that here the ship-master and all on board were kept prisoners for some days.

To supplement this document, we may add a statement from Mr. Ford’s edition of Bradford’s *History* (I, 178), namely, that *Mourt’s Relation* “was carried to England by Robert Cushman, who, sailing in the *Fortune*, did not reach London till February, 1622”; and that on June 29, 1622, the *Relation* was entered in the Stationers’ Register under the title, *Newes from neue England*. Elsewhere (I, 268), in the same edition of the *History* Bradford further gives a letter from Cushman, in which he says that the vessel was kept in France for fifteen days, and that he and his fellow-passengers did not reach home until February 17–27, 1621–22.

Thus we obtain the final link in the chain of evidence which proves beyond the shadow of a doubt that the first section of *Mourt’s Relation* is really Bradford’s Relation, for two distinct Relations treating of exactly the same matters would hardly have been carried from Plymouth

⁵ S. P. Colonial, Vol. V, No. 112, E. Arber, *Story of the Pilgrim Fathers*, 1897, pp. 506, 507.

on the same vessel at one time, one of them by Governor Bradford and the other by an entirely unknown person bearing the ghost-name "Mourt"; and furthermore in case there had by any chance been two such Relations and one of them by Bradford, it is certain that Cushman would have carried that by the Governor and not that by the utterly unknown "Mourt." The same evidence makes it also probable that after the manuscript had been taken away, and very likely some time between February, 1621-22 and June 29, 1622, the first Relation was returned to Cushman or at least sent on to England as the outcome of the Complaint which had been issued. Thus we obtain a better understanding of the wanderings of the manuscript of Bradford's earliest description of the settlement at Plymouth.

The second so-called Relation printed with that by Bradford, as I have previously indicated in a note, is made up chiefly of letters or parts of letters by Winslow, and consequently was also not composed by "Mourt," though in England Morton may perhaps have added the headings to the several sections and may have given the extended title to the book when it was sent to the press.

Unless we are mistaken, the first *Relation or Iovrnall* gains a new historical value by our present definite knowledge that it was certainly written by Governor Bradford himself. Well might Professor Arber, who by the way did not believe that the original document by Bradford had really survived, and who concluded by a rather bad process of reasoning ⁶ that Edward Winslow was the probable author of the first Relation as printed, assert with much feeling, that "Posterity will always owe a grudge to this noble thief [Monsieur le Marquis de Cera] for his robbery of Governor Bradford's despatch, unless it should happily

⁶ Story of the Pilgrim Fathers, 1897, p. 416, note. If Winslow, or any other Pilgrim besides Bradford, had been the author, he would have written "Master William Bradford," not simply "William Bradford."

be recovered from among the existing French archives; and then posterity would bless him forever";⁷ and that "Doubtless, the Marquis kept it in order to send it up to the Court at Paris"! But in this opinion Dr. Arber was certainly wrong, unless indeed the document was sent back from Paris before June 29, 1622.

The Pilgrim Fathers upon their arrival on American shores were very much interested in their natural surroundings and in the neighboring Indians, and fortunately were very keen observers and reporters of the primitive objects and strange customs which they saw. Perhaps, indeed, they might not inappropriately be called the first archæologists of New England, and some of the details noted by them are of value even today. For convenience, I have grouped the subjects treated in this early literature to which I wish to call attention under three main headings, namely, I, The Story of the Voyage and of the Pilgrims' Choice of a Site for their Settlement; II, The Earliest Descriptions of Plymouth Plantation and an Account of its Gradual Fortification; and III, The Pilgrims and the Indians.

I. THE STORY OF THE VOYAGE AND OF THE PILGRIMS' CHOICE OF A SITE FOR THEIR SETTLEMENT

Bradford's *Relation or Iovrnall*⁸ opens with the following familiar but informing account of the arrival of the Pilgrims at Cape Cod and of their search for a suitable site upon which to found their settlement. The description, though wanting the literary charm of a writer like John Pory, is straightforward and graphic, and gives

⁷ Story of the Pilgrim Fathers, p. 507, note. Winslow's letter [the second so-called Relation] and Bradford's Relation were no doubt both published without the consent of their respective authors, but that fact would not prove that these were not the genuine and original accounts.

⁸ This rare and valuable work as published bore the following title: A | RELATION OR | Iournall of the beginning and proceedings | of the English Plantation settled at *Plimoth* in NEW | ENGLAND, by certaine English Aduenturers both | Merchants and

some archæological details of real interest. For instance, in one place mention is made of the fact that the Pilgrims found in some of the Indian graves quantities of red powder, which had a strong but not offensive odor and was manifestly employed for purposes of embalming. Perhaps, indeed, this is the earliest reference now known to the so-called "Red-Paint People," to whom Mr. Warren K. Moorehead of Andover has paid so much attention in recent years.⁹ It would be of considerable value if we could learn whether the occupants of such graves came originally from Maine. Bradford's suggestion that the red powder was used for embalming is of interest, since it readily explains one feature of the so-called Indian Red-Paint burials in Maine which hitherto, I fancy, has not been understood. Some other important characteristics of Indian burials also are given in this narrative which, I believe, may help us to explain certain hitherto puzzling remains of the so-called Mound Builders.

A RELATION OR IOVRNALL OF THE PROCEEDINGS OF THE
PLANTATION SETTLED AT *Plimoth* IN NEW ENGLAND ¹⁰

Wednesday, the sixt of *September*, the Wind comming East North East, a fine small gale, we loosed from *Plimoth* [England], hauing beene kindly intertaind and curteously vsed by diuers friends there dwelling, and after many difficulties in boysterous stormes, at length by Gods prouidence vpon the ninth of *Nouember* following, by breake of the day, we espied land which we deemed to be *Cape Cod*, and so

others. | With their difficult passage, their safe ariual, their | ioyfull building of, and comfortable planting them- | selues in the now well defended Towne | of NEW PLIMOTH. | . . . London, 1622, 4°.

There is evidence in the work as printed to show that Winslow's letters were written in the secretarial hand of the period. Various misreadings by the compositor make this point clear. A statement in Robert Cushman's preface suggests that Bradford may have inserted in his narrative reports by others of certain events, not witnessed by himself.

⁹ See his writings entitled *The Red-Paint People of Maine*, 1913; *The Problem of the Red-Paint People*, Washington, 1916; and *Prehistoric Cultures in the State of Maine*, Washington, D.C., 1917.

¹⁰ The punctuation and capitalization of the citations, for convenience in reading, have been to some extent normalized.

afterward it proued. And the appearance of it much comforted vs; especially seeing so goodly a Land and woodded to the brinke of the sea, it caused vs to reioyce together and praise God that had giuen vs once againe to see land. And thus wee made our course South South West, purposing to goe to a Riuer ten leagues to the South of the Cape [i.e., the Hudson River]; but at night the winde being contrary we put round againe for the Bay of *Cape Cod*, and vpon the 2 of *Nouember* we came to an anchor in the Bay, which is a good harbour and pleasant Bay, circled round except in the entrance, which is about foure miles ouer from land to land, compassed about to the very Sea with Okes, Pines, Iuniper, Sassafras, and other sweet wood. It is a harbour wherein 1000. saile of Ships may safely ride. There we relieued our selues with wood and water and refreshed our people, while our shallop was fitted to coast the Bay to search for an habitation. There was the greatest store of fowle that ever we saw.

And euery day we saw Whales playing hard by vs, of which in that place, if we had [had] instruments & meanes to take them, we might haue made a very rich returne, which to our great grieve we wanted. Our master and his mate and others experienced in fishing professed we might haue made three or foure thousand pounds worth of Oyle. They preferred it before Greenland Whale-fishing & purpose the next winter to fish for Whale here. For Cod we assayed but found none; there is good store no doubt in their season. Neither got we any fish all the time we lay there but some few little ones on the shore. We found great Mussels and very fat and full of Sea pearle, but we could not eat them, for they made vs all sicke that did eat, as well saylers as passengers. . . . The bay is so round & circling, that before we could come to anchor we went round all the points of the Compasse. We could not come neere the shore by three quarters of an English mile, because of shallow water, which was a great preiudice to vs, for our people going on shore were forced to wade a bow-shoot or two in going a-land which caused many to get colds and coughs, for it was ny times freezing cold weather. . . .

The same day, so soon as we could, we set a-shore 15 or 16 men, well armed, with some to fetch wood, for we had none left, as also to see what the Land was, and what Inhabitants they could meet with. They found it to be a small neck of Land; on this side where we lay is the *Bay*, and [on] the further side the Sea; the ground or earth, sand hils, much like the Downes in *Holland*, but much better; the crust of the earth a Spits depth excellent blacke earth, all woodded with Okes, Pines, Sassafras, Iuniper, Birch, Holly, Vines, some Ash, Walnut; the wood for the most part open and without vnder-wood,

fit either to goe [on foot] or ride in. At night our people returned, but found not any person nor habitation, and laded their Boat with Iuniper, which smelled very sweet & strong, and of which we burnt the most part of the time we lay there. . . .¹¹ When we had refreshed our selues, we directed our course full South, that we might come to shore, which within a short while after we did, and there made a fire, that they in the ship might see where wee were (as we had direction), and so marched on towards this supposed River; and as we went in another valley we found a fine cleere Pond of fresh water, being about a Musket shot broad and twice as long. There grew also many small vines, and Foule and Deere haunted there; there grew much Sasafra. From thence we went on & found much plaine ground, about fittie Acres, fit for the Plow, and some signes where the *Indians* had formerly planted their corne. After this . . . we found a little path to certaine heapes of sand, one whereof was covered with old Matts, and had a wooden thing like a mortar whelmed on the top of it, and an earthen pot layd in a little hole at the end thereof. We musing what it might be digged & found a Bow, and as we thought Arrowes, but they were rotten. We supposed there were many other things [there], but because we deemed them graues,¹² we put in the Bow againe and made it vp as it was, and left the rest vntouched, because we thought it would be odious vnto them to ransacke their Sepulchers. We went on further and found new stubble, of which they had gotten Corne this yeare, and many Wallnut trees full of Nuts, and great store of Strawberries, and some Vines. Passing thus a field or two which were not great, we came to another which had also bin new gotten, and there we found where an house had beene and foure or fiue old Plankes layed together; also we found a great Kettle which had beene some Ships kete and brought out of *Europe*; there was also an heape of sand, made like the former, but it was newly done. We might see how they had padled it with their hands, which we digged vp, and in it we found a little old Basket full of faire *Indian* Corne, and digged further & found a fine new Basket full of very faire corne of this yeare, with some 36 goodly eares of corne, some yellow, and some red, and others mixt with blew, which was a very goodly sight. The Basket was round and narrow at the top. It held about three or foure Bushels, which was as much as two of vs could lift vp from the ground, and was very handsomely and cunningly made. But whilst wee were busie about

¹¹ Pp. 1-4.

¹² Dr. Dexter thinks these graves were "somewhere in what is now the village of Great Hollow."

these things, we set our men Sentinell in a round ring, all but two or three which digged vp the corne. We were in suspence what to do with it and the Kettle, and at length after much consultation we concluded to take the Kettle and as much of the Corne as we could carry away with vs, and when our Shallop came, if we could find any of the people, . . . we would giue them the Kettle againe and satisfie them for their Corne. So we tooke all the eares and put a good deale of the loose Corne in the Kettle for two men to bring away on a staffe; besides, they that could put any into their Pockets filled the same; the rest wee buried againe, for we were so laden with Armour that we could carry no more. Not farre from this place we found the remainder of an old Fort, or Palizide, which as we conceiued had beene made by some Christians, . . . so we returned leaving the farther discovery . . . and came that night backe againe to the fresh water pond, and there we made our Randevous that night, making a great fire and a Baricado to windward of vs, and kept good watch with three Sentinells all night, euery one standing when his turne came, while five or sixe inches of Match was burning. It proved a very rainie night. . . . In the end wee got out of the Wood, and were fallen about a myle too high aboue the creak, where we saw three Bucks, but we had rather haue had one of them! Wee also did spring three couple of Partridges, and as we came along by the creak, wee saw great flocks of wild Geese and Duckes, but they were very fearefull of vs. So we marched some while in the Woods, some while on the sands, and other while in the water vp to the knees, till at length we came neare the Ship, and then we shot off our Peeces, and the long Boat came to fetch vs. . . . This was our first Discovery . . . but the discommodiousness of the harbour did much hinder vs, for we could neither goe to, nor come from, the shore but at high water, which was much to our hinderance and hurt, for oftentimes they waded to the midle of the thigh, and oft to the knees, to goe and come from land; some did it necessarily and some for their owne pleasure, but it brought to the most, if not to all, coughes and colds, the weather prouing sodainly cold and stormie, which afterward turned to the scurvey, whereof many dyed.¹³

When our Shallop was fit . . . there was appointed some 24 men of our owne, and armed, then to goe and make a more full discovery of the rivers [Pamet River and its three branches] before mentioned. Master *Iones* was desirous to goe with vs. . . . Wee made master *Iones* our Leader. . . . When we were set forth, it proued rough weather and crosse windes, so as we were constrained, some in the

¹³ Pp. 5-8.

Shallop, and others in the long Boate, to row to the neerest shore the wind would suffer them to goe vnto, and then to wade out about the knees. The wind was so strong as the Shallop could not keepe the water, but was forced to harbour there that night. . . . It blowed and did snow all that day & night, and frose withall; some of our people that are dead tooke the originall of their death here. The next day about 11 a-clocke . . . we sayled to the river . . . which we named *Cold Harbour*. . . . We landed our men betweene the two creekes . . . and our Shallop followed vs. At length night grew on, and our men were tired with marching vp and downe the steepe hills and deepe vallies which lay halfe a foot thicke with snow. Master *Iones* wearied with marching was desirous we should take vp our lodging, though some of vs would haue marched further, so we made there our Randevous for that night vnder a few Pine trees, and as it fell out wee got three fat Geese and six Ducks to our Supper, which we eate [= ate] with Souldiers stomacks, for we had eaten little all that day. . . . In the morning . . . we turned towards the other creeke, that wee might goe over and looke for the rest of the Corne that we left behind when we were here before. When we came to the creeke, we saw the Canow lie on the dry ground, and a flocke of Geese in the river, at which one made a shot and killed a couple of them, and we lanchd the Canow & fetcht them, and when we had done, she carryed vs over by seaven or eight at once. This done, we marched to the place where we had [found] the corne formerly, which place we called *Corne-hill*, and digged and found more corne, viz., two or three Baskets full of *Indian Wheat* [= Corn] and a bag of Beanes with a good many of faire Wheat-eares.¹⁴ Whilst some of vs were digging vp this, some others found another heape of Corne, which they digged vp also, so as we had in all about ten Bushels, which will serue vs sufficiently for seed. And sure it was Gods good providence that we found this Corne, for els wee know not how we should haue done. . . . Also we had neuer in all likelihood seene a graine of it, if we had not made our first Iourney, for the ground was now covered with snow, and so hard frosen, that we were faine with our Curtlaxes and short Swords to hew and carue the ground a foot deepe, and then wrest it vp with leavers, for we had forgot to bring other Tooles. . . .

The next morning we followed certaine beaten pathes and tracts [= tracks] of the *Indians* into the Woods, supposing they would haue led vs into some Towne, or houses. After wee had gone a while, we light [= came] vpon a very broad beaten path, well nigh two

¹⁴ That is, a good many faire eares of Corn.

foote broad, when we lighted all our Matches, and prepared our selues, concluding wee were neare their dwellings, but in the end we found it to be onely a path made to driue Deere in when the *Indians* hunt, as wee supposed. When we had marched fīue or six myles into the Woods and could find no signes of any people, we returned againe another way, and as we came into the plaine ground, wee found a place like a graue, but it was much bigger and longer than any we had yet seene. It was also covered with boords, so as [= so that] we mused what it should be, and resolved to digge it vp; where we found first a Matt, and vnder that a fayre Bow, and there another Matt, and vnder that a boord about three quarters [of a yard] long finely carued and paynted, with three tynes or broches on the top, like a Crowne; also betweene the Matts we found Boules, Trayses, Dishes, and such like Trinkets. At length we came to a faire new Matt, and vnder that two Bundles, the one bigger, the other lesse. We opened the greater and found in it a great quantitie of fine and perfect red Powder, and in it the bones and skull of a man. The Skull had fine yellow haire still on it and some of the flesh vnconsumed. There was bound vp with it a knife, a pack-needle, and two or three old iron things. It was bound vp in a Saylers canvas Casacke and a payre of cloth breeches. The red Powder was a kind of Embaulment and yeelded a strong but no offensiue smell. It was as fine as any flower. We opened the lesse bundle likewise, and found [some] of the same Powder in it, and the bones and head of a little childe. About the leggs and other parts of it was bound strings and bracelets of fine white Beads; there was also by it a little Bow, about three quarters [of a yard] long and some other odd [nic]knacks. We brought sundry of the pretiest things away with vs and covered the Corps vp againe. After this we digged in sundry like places but found no more Corne nor any things els but graues. There was varietie of opinions amongst vs about the embalmed person. Some thought it was an *Indian* Lord and King. Others sayd, The *Indians* haue all blacke hayre, and never any was seene with browne or yellow hayre. Some thought it was a Christian of some speciall note, which had dyed amongst them, and they thus buried him to honour him. Others thought they had killed him, and did it in triumph over him. . . .¹⁵

Others againe vrged greatly the going to *Anguūm* or *Angoum*,¹⁶ a place twentie leagues off to the Northwards, which they had heard to be an excellent harbour for ships [with] better ground and better

¹⁵ Pp. 9–12.

¹⁶ Hitherto Angoum or Anguūm has been interpreted to mean Ipswich, but Ipswich can hardly be said to have an excellent harbor for ships. Furthermore, it now becomes

fishing. Secondly, for any thing we knew, there might be hard by vs a farre better seate, and it should be a great hindrance to seate [= settle] where wee should remoue againe. Thirdly, the water was but in ponds, and it was thought there would be none in Summer, or very little. Fourthly, the water there must be fetched vp a steepe hill; but to omit many reasons and replies vsed heere abouts, it was in the ende concluded to make some discovery within the Bay, but in no case so farre [north] as *Angoum*. Besides, *Robert Coppin* our Pilot, made relation of a great Navigable River and good harbour in the other head-land of this Bay, almost right over against *Cape Cod*, being a right line, not much aboue eight leagues distant, in which hee had beene once. . . .¹⁷ The narration of which Discovery followes, penned by one of the Company.

Wednesday, the sixt of December, we set out, [it] being very cold and hard weather. Wee were a long while after we launched from the ship before we could get cleare of a sandie poynt, which lay within lesse then a furlong of the same. In which time two were very sicke, and *Edward Tilley* had like to haue sounded [= swooned] with cold; the Gunner was also sicke vnto Death . . . and so remained all that day, and the next night. At length we got cleare of the sandy poynt and got vp our sayles, and within an houre or two we got vnder the weather shore, and then had smoother water and better sayling, but it was very cold, for the water frose on our clothes, and made them many times like coats of Iron. Wee sayled sixe or seaven leagues by the shore, but saw neither river nor creeke. At length wee mett with a tongue of Land, being flat off from the shore with a sandy poynt. We bore vp to gaine the poynt & found there a fayre income or rode of a Bay, being a league over at the narrowest, and some two or three in length, but wee made right over to the land before vs, and left the discovery of this *Income* till the next day. . . . In the morning . . . we found it onely to be a Bay without either river or creeke comming into it, yet we deemed it to be as good an harbour as *Cape Cod*, for they that sounded it found a ship might ride [there] in fue fathom water. Wee on the land found it to be a levill soyle, but none of the fruitfullest; wee saw two beckes [= brooks] of fresh water, which were the first running streames that we saw in the Country, but one might stride over them; we found also a great fish called a *Grampus* dead on the sands. They in the Shallop

manifest from the recently discovered letters of John Pory, that Angoum or Anguam does not stand for Agawam at all, but for "Anquam, scituate within Cape Anna, aboute 40 leagues from Plimouth," evidently now known as Annisquam.

¹⁷ P. 14.

found two of them also in the bottome of the bay, dead in like sort. They were cast vp at high water and could not get off for the frost and ice; they were some fīue or sixe paces long, and about two inches thicke of fat, and fleshed like a Swine. They would haue yeilded a great deale of oyle, if there had beene time and meanes to haue taken it. . . . We then directed our course along the Sea-sands, to the place where we first saw the *Indians* when we were there. We saw it was also a *Grampus* which they were cutting vp; they cut it into long rands or peeces about an ell long and two handfull broad; wee found here and there a peece scattered by the way, as it seemed, for hast. This place the most were minded we should call the *Grampus Bay*, because we found so many of them there. Wee followed the tract [= track] of the *Indians* bare feete a good way on the sands; at length we saw where they strucke into the Woods by the side of a Pond [Great Pond] . . . so we light [came] on a path, but saw no house, and followed [the path] a great way into the woods; ¹⁸ at length wee found where Corne had beene set, but not that yeare. Anone [= Anon] we found a great burying place, one part whereof was incompassed with a large Palazado like a Church-yard, with yong spires [= saplings] foure or fīue yards long set so close one by another as they could [be], two or three foot in the ground. Within, it was full of Graues, some bigger and some lesse, some were also paled about, & others had like an *Indian-house* made over them, but not matted. Those Graues were more sumptuous then those at *Corne-hill*, yet we digged none of them vp, but onely viewed them and went our way. Without the Palazado were graues also, but not so costly. From this place we went and found more Corne ground, but not of this yeare. As we ranged, we light [came] on foure or fīue *Indian-houses*, which had been lately dwelt in, but they were vncovered and had no matts about them, els they were like those we found at *Corne-hill*, but had not beene so lately dwelt in. There was nothing left but two or three peeces of old matts [and] a little sedge. Also a little further [on] we found two Baskets full of parched Acorns hid in the ground, which we supposed had beene Corne, when we beganne to dig the same. We cast earth thereon againe & went our way.”¹⁹

With this account of an Indian burying ground we may compare the description given by Edward Winslow of the house and burial-place of the Indian king, Nanepashemet.

¹⁸ Dr. H. M. Dexter (*Mourt's Relation*, Boston, 1865, note 175) suggests “in the direction of Enoch's Rock and Nauset light.”

¹⁹ Pp. 15-18.

It is to be noted that the house was situated on the top of a hill or mound, as was probably the case likewise with the houses of the kings of the Mound Builders in the Mississippi valley. Nanepashemet, we are told, was buried within a circular earthwork forty or fifty feet in diameter, having a trench breast-high both on the inside and on the outside. The enclosure was surrounded by a strong palisade of poles thirty or forty feet long sunk firmly in the ground as close to each other as possible. The only approach to the enclosure was a bridge, and in the centre of the palisado stood the frame of an Indian house, beneath which the king was buried. Had the country not been invaded by European settlers, and had there been time for the last resting-place of the king to become venerated, a mound might later on perhaps have been heaped above the house, and then the fortification would have strikingly resembled some of the mounds in the Mississippi Valley:

"On the morrow we went ashore, all but two men, and marched in Armes vp in the Countrey. Hauing gone three myles, we came to a place where Corne had beene newly gathered, a house pulled downe, and the people gone. A myle from hence [? near Medford], *Nanepashemet* their King in his life-time had liued. His house was not like others, but a scaffold was largely built with pools [= poles] and plancks some six foote from [the] ground, and the house vpon that, being situated on the top of a hill.

Not farre from hence in a bottome [? now near Mystic Pond, Medford,] wee came to a Fort built by their deceased King, the manner thus: There were pools [= poles] some thirtie or fortie foote long stucke in the ground as thicke as they could be set one by another, and with these they inclosed a ring some forty or fifty foote ouer. A trench breast high was digged on each side. One way there was to goe into it with a bridge. In the midst of this Pallizado stood the frame of an house, wherein being dead he lay buried.

About a myle from hence, we came to such another [? house], but seated on the top of an hill. Here *Nanepashemet* was killed, none dwelling in it since the time of his death.²⁰

²⁰ A Relation, 1622, p. 58 (in the second so-called Relation which was not written by Bradford but which consists of several sections probably for the most part written

II. THE EARLIEST DESCRIPTION OF PLYMOUTH PLANTATION AND AN ACCOUNT OF ITS GRADUAL FORTIFICATION

The following descriptions of Plymouth (formerly Patuxet) by Bradford and by Winslow respectively may very fittingly be compared with Pory's similar description of 1622.

[Bradford]

"On the fifteenth day we waighed Anchor to goe to the place we had discovered, and comming within two leagues of the Land we could not fetch the Harbour, but were faine to put roome againe towards *Cape Cod*, our course lying West; and the wind was at North west, but it pleased God that the next day being Saturday, the 16 day [of December, 1620], the winde came faire, and wee put to Sea againe, and came safely into a safe Harbour; and within halfe an houre the winde changed, so as [= so that] if we had beene letted [= hindered] but a little, we had gone backe to *Cape Cod*. This Harbour is a Bay greater then *Cape Cod*, compassed with a goodly Land, and in the Bay 2 fine Islands vninhabited, wherein are nothing but wood — Okes, Pines, Walnut, Beech, Sasifras, Vines, and other trees which wee know not. This Bay is a most hopefull place, [containing] innumerable store of fowle, and excellent good, and [there] cannot but bee [an abundance] of fish in their seasons — Skate, Cod, Turbot, and Herring. Wee haue tasted of abundance of Musles, the greatest & best that ever we saw, Crabs and Lobsters, in their time infinite. It is in fashion like a Cikle [= sickle] or Fish-hooke.

Monday, the 18 day [of December], we went a-land, manned with the Maister of the Ship and 3 or 4 of the Saylers. We marched along the coast in the woods, some 7 or 8 mile, but saw not an *Indian* nor an *Indian*-house, only we found where formerly had beene some Inhabitants, and where they had planted their corne. We found not

by Winslow). In this connection we will add the following instructive passage from Winslow's *Good Newes*, p. 58, which shows how the sachems were buried:

"When they bury the dead, they sow vp the corps in a mat and so put it in the earth. If the party bee a *Sachim*, they cover him with many curious mats, and bury all his riches with him, and inclose the graue with a pale. If it bee a childe, the father will also put his owne most speciall iewels and ornaments in the earth with it. . . . If it be the man or woman of the house, they will pull downe the mattes and leaue the frame standing, and burie them in or neere the same, and either remoue their dwelling or giue ouer house-keeping."

any Navigable River, but 4 or 5 small running brookes of very sweet fresh water that all run into the Sea. The land for the crust of the earth is a spits depth excellent blacke mold and fat in some places. [There are] 2 or 3 great Oakes but not very thicke, Pines, Wal-nuts, Beech, Ash, Birch, Hasell, Holley, Asp[en?], Sasifras in abundance, & Vines euerywhere, Cherry trees, Plum-trees, and many other which we know not. Most kinds of hearbes we found heere in Winter as Strawberry leaues innumerable, Sorrell, Yarow, Caruell, Brooklime, Liver-wort, Water-cresses, great store of Leekes and Onyons, and an excellent strong kind of Flaxe, and Hempe. Here is sand, gravell, and excellent clay (no better in the Worlde), [which is] excellent for pots and will wash like sope, and great store of stone though somewhat soft, and the best water that ever wee drunke, and the Brookes now begin to be full of fish. That night many being weary with marching, wee went abourd againe.”²¹

[Winslow]

“[As] for the temper of the ayre here, it agreeth well with that in *England*, and if there be any difference at all, this [country] is somewhat hotter in Summer. Some thinke it to be colder in Winter, but I cannot out of experience so say. The ayre is very cleere and not foggie, as hath beene reported. I neuer in my life remember a more seasonable yeare then we haue here enioyed, and if we haue once but Kine, Horses, and Sheepe, I make no question but men might liue as contented here as in any part of the world. For fish and fowle, we haue great abundance; fresh Codd in the Summer is but course meat with vs. Our Bay is full of Lobsters all the Summer, and affordeth varietie of other Fish. In September we can take a Hogshead of Eeles in a night with small labour, & can dig them out of their beds all the Winter. We haue Mussells and Clams²² at our doores. Oysters we haue none neere, but we can haue them brought by the *Indians* when we will; all the Spring time the earth sendeth forth naturally very good Sallet Herbs; here are Grapes, white and red, and very sweete and strong also, Strawberies, Gooseberies, Raspas, &c., Plums of three sorts, with blacke and red, being almost as good as a Damsen; abundance of Roses, white, red, and damask, single, but very sweet indeed. The Countrey wanteth onely industrious men to imploy, for it would grieue your hearts (if as I) you had seene so

²¹ Bradford, *Relation*, pp. 21–22.

²² Printed text, “Othus.” Dr. Dexter suggested the reading, clams, as is certainly correct. This part of the MS., therefore was manifestly written in the secretarial or decadent Court Hand of the period, which was in this case misread by the compositor.

many myles together by goodly Riuers vninhabited, and withall to consider those parts of the world wherein you liue to be euen greatly burthened with abundance of people.”²³

The Pilgrims planned their settlement with great speed when once they had chosen a suitable site. And haste was necessary, for it was already almost Christmas time, and they were faced by the rigors of a New England winter. By combining these first accounts of Plymouth we may obtain an excellent idea of the appearance and life of the little colony in its earliest days, and various interesting details concerning its defense and enlargement during the first two decades of its history:

“That night [December 19–29] we returned againe a-ship-board, with resolution the next morning to settle on some of those places; so in the morning [of December 20–30], after we had called on God for direction, we came to this resolution, to goe presently ashore againe and to take a better view of two places which wee thought most fitting for vs, for we could not now take time for further search or consideration, our victuals being much spent, especially our Beere, and it being now the 19 of *December*. After our landing and viewing of the place so well as we could, we came to a conclusion by most voyces, [namely,] to set[tle] on the maine Land on the first place,²⁴ on an high ground, where there is a great deale of Land cleared, and hathe beene planted with Corne three or four yeares agoe, and [where] there is a very sweet brooke [i.e., Town Brooke] [which] runnes vnder the hillside, and many delicate springs of as good water as can be drunke, and where we may harbour our Shallops and Boates exceeding well, and in this brooke much good fish in their seasons. On the further side of the river also much Corne ground [has been] cleared; in one field is a great hill [i.e., Burial Hill], on which wee poynt to make a platforme, and plant our Ordinance, which will command all round about. From thence we may see into the *Bay*, and farre into the Sea, and we may see thence *Cape Cod*. Our greatest labour will be fetching of our wood, which is halfe a quarter of an English myle [distant], but there is enough so farre off. What people inhabite here we yet know not, for as yet we haue seene none, so

²³ Relation, p. 58 (second Relation, written not by Bradford but evidently by Winslow).

²⁴ That is, Patuxet or Plymouth.

there we made our Randevous and a place for some of our people, about twentie resolving in the morning to come all ashore, and to build houses. . . .²⁵

Thursday the 28 of *December* [or January 7, 1620–21], so many as could went to worke on the hill where we purposed to build our plat-forme for our Ordinance, and which doth command all the plaine and the *Bay*, and from whence we may see farre into the sea, and [which] might be easier impayled, having two rowes of houses and a faire streete. So in the afternoone we went to measure out the grounds, and first we tooke notice how many Families they were, willing all single men that had no wiues to ioyn with some Familie as they thought fit, that so we might build fewer houses, which was done, and we reduced them to 19 Families. To greater Families we allotted larger plots, to every person half a pole in breadth, and three in length, and so Lots were cast where euery man should lie, which was done, and staked out. We thought this proportion was large enough at first for houses and gardens, to impale them round, considering the weaknes of our people, many of them growing ill with coldes, for our former Discoveries in frost and stormes, and the wading at Cape *Cod* had brought much weakenes amongst vs, and after[wards] was the cause of many of their deaths.²⁶

Tuesday, the 9 [or 19] Ianuary [1620–21], was a reasonable faire day, and wee went to labour that day in the building of our Towne in two rowes of houses for more safety. We devided by lott the plot of ground whereon to build our Towne. After the proportion formerly allotted, we agreed that every man should build his owne house, thinking by that course men would make more hast[e] then working in common. The common house, in which for the first we made our Randevous, being neere finished wanted onely couering, it being about 20 foote square. Some should make mortar and some gather thatch, so that in four days halfe of it was thatched. Frost and foule weather hindred vs much; this time of the yeare seldome could wee worke halfe the weeke.²⁷

Munday, the 22 [January or February 1], was a faire day. We wrought on our houses, and in the after-noone carried vp our hogsh-heads of meale to our common store-house.²⁸ Saturday, the 17 [or 27] day [of February], in the morning we called a meeting for the establishing of military Orders amongst our selues, and we chose *Miles Standish* our Captaine, and gaue him authoritie of command in affayres; and as we were in consultation here abouts, two Savages

²⁵ Bradford, *Relation*, p. 23.

²⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. 24, 25.

²⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. 26, 27.

²⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 29.

presented themselves vpon the top of an hill over against our Plantation about a quarter of a myle and lesse [distant]. . . . This caused vs to plant our great Ordinances in places most convenient. Wednesday, the 21 [or 31] of *February*, the master came on shore with many of his Saylers, and brought with him one of the great Peeces, called a *Minion*, and helped vs to draw it vp the hill, with another Peece that lay on shore, and mounted them, and a saller [= saker] and two bases. Saturday, the third [or thirteenth] of *March*, the wind was South, the morning mistie, but towards noone warme and fayre weather. The Birds sang in the Woods most pleasantly; at one of the Clocke it thundred, which was the first wee heard in that Country. It was strong and great claps, but short, but after an houre it rayned very sadly till midnight. Wednesday, the seaventh [or seventeenth] of *March*, the wind was full East, cold, but faire. That day Master *Carver* with fiae other[s] went to the great Ponds, which seeme to be excellent fishing-places; all the way they went they found it exceedingly beaten and haunted with Deere, but they saw none. Amongst other foule, they saw one, a milk white foule, with a very blacke head. This day some garden seede were sowen.²⁹

Referring you for further satisfaction to our more large Relations (of which the greater part of this book is composed), you shall vnderstand that in this little time that a few of vs haue beene here, we haue built seauen dwelling houses, and foure for the [common] vse of the Plantation, and haue made preparation for diuers others. We set the last Spring [1621] some twentie Acres of *Indian* Corne and sowed some six Acres of Barly & Pease, and according to the manner of the *Indians* we manured our ground with Herings or rather Shadds [*i.e.*, alewives], which we haue in great abundance, and take with great ease at our doores. Our Corne did proue well, & God be prayed, we had a good increase of *Indian*-Corne, and our Barly indifferent good, but our Pease [were] not worth the gathering, for we feared they were too late sowne. They came vp very well and blossomed, but the Sunne parched them in the blossome. Our harvest being gotten in, our Governour sent foure men on fowling, that so we might after a more speciall manner reioyce together, after we had gathered the fruit of our labours. They foure in one day killed as much fowle, as with a little helpe beside served the Company almost a weeke, at which time amongst other Recreations we exercised our Armes, many of the *Indians* coming amongst vs, and amongst the rest their greatest King *Massasoyt*, with some ninetie men, whom

²⁹ Bradford, Relation, pp. 31, 32.

for three days we entertained and feasted, and they went out and killed five Deere, which they brought to the Plantation and bestowed on our Governour, and vpon the Captaine, and others. . . . Wee haue found the *Indians* very faithfull in their Covenant of Peace with vs; very louing and readie to pleasure vs. We often goe to them, and they come to vs; some of vs haue bin fiftie myles by Land in the Country with them. . . . They are a people . . . very trustie, quicke of apprehension, ripe witted, iust. The men and women goe naked [with] onely a skin about their middles.”³⁰

Apparently it was only gradually that a sense of insecurity became keenly felt by the Pilgrims, for it was not until February, 1621–22, that the little plantation was impaled and fortified, while the fort was not made fit for service until March 25, 1623. On that day a watch was first kept:

“In the meane time, knowing our owne weaknesse, notwithstanding our high words and loftie lookes towards them [the Indians], and still lying open to all casualty, hauing as yet (vnder God) no other defence than our Armes, wee thought it most needfull to impale our Towne, which with all our expedition wee accomplished in the moneth of February [1621–2] and some few dayes, taking in the top of the Hill vnder which our Towne is seated, making foure bulwarkes or ietties without the ordinarie circuit of the pale, from whence wee could defend the whole Towne; in three whereof are gates, and the fourth in time to be. . . .”³¹

Now [*i.e.*, March 25, 1623] was our Fort made fit for seruice and some Ordnance mounted; and though it may seeme long worke, it being ten moneths since it [was] begun, yet wee must note that where so great a work is begun with such small means, a little time cannot bring [it] to perfection. . . . Thus was our Fort hanselled, this being the first day as I take it that euer any watch was there kept.”³²

Captain John Smith gives the following singularly complete though brief, description of Plymouth in 1624:³³

“In this Plantation [of New-Plimouth] there is about an hundred and fourescore persons, some Cattell, but many Swine and Poultry.

³⁰ Relation, pp. 60, 61 (section by Edward Winslow).

³¹ Edward Winslow, Good Newes, 1624, p. 4.

³² Ibid., pp. 39, 40.

³³ Advertisements, London, 1631, pp. 18, 19.

Their Towne contains two and thirty houses, whereof seven were burnt, with the value of five or six hundred pounds in other goods, impaired about halfe a mile,³⁴ within which a high Mount, a Fort, with a Watch-tower, well built of stone, lome, and wood, their Ordnance well mounted, and so healthfull, that of the first Planters not one hath died this three years; yet at the first landing at *Cape Cod*, being an hundred passengers, besides twenty they had left behind at *Plimoth* for want of good take heed, . . . [they] spent six or seven weekes in wandring up and downe in frost and snow, wind and raine, among the woods, cricks, and swamps, forty of them died, and three-score were left in most miserable estate at *New-Plimoth*, where their Ship left them, and but nine leagues by Sea from where they landed, whose misery and variable opinions, for want of experience, occasioned much faction, till necessity agreed them."

As the settlement of the colony became better established, the inhabitants naturally, for their own convenience, began to occupy new land and to build new houses, so that apparently even as early as 1636 some of the families owned more than one house, as the following passage shows:

"And whereas some gather the ground [of New England] to be naught, and soone out of heart, because *Plimouth* men³⁵ remove from their old habitations, I answer, they do no more remove from their habitation, than the Citizen which hath one house in the Citie and another in the Countrey, for his pleasure, health and profit. For although they have taken new plots of ground, and build houses upon them, yet doe they retaine their old houses still, and repaire to them every Sabbath day; neither doe they esteeme their old lots worse than when they first tooke them. What if they doe not plant on them every yeare? I hope it is no ill husbandry to rest the land, nor is alwayes that the worst that lies sometimes fallow. . . . This ground is in some places of a soft mould, and easie to plow; in other places so tough and hard, that I have seen ten Oxen toyled, their Iron chaines broken, and their Shares and Coulters much strained; but after the first breaking up it is so easie, that two Oxen and a Horse may plow it; there hath as good *English* Corne growne there, as could be desired; especially Rie and Oates and Barly; there hath been no great triall as yet of Wheate, and Beanes.³⁶

³⁴ John Pory says that the palisade about the plantation in 1622 was "2700 foote in compasse" (John Pory's *Lost Description*, 1913, p. 42).

³⁵ Text, *meu*. ³⁶ William Wood, *New Englands Prospect*, London, 1636, p. 11.

III. THE PILGRIMS AND THE INDIANS

During their first years in America the Pilgrims were more troubled by a shortage of food supplies than by the Indians. Indeed, the Pilgrims were not much disturbed by them until the spring of 1621, when they began to receive visits like the following. These descriptions seem to us of importance, since they show that the Indians known to the Pilgrim Fathers must have dressed and painted themselves in a manner very similar to that practised by the Aztecs in Mexico, whose surviving manuscripts in brilliant colors still preserve for us their general appearance and dress, together with some of their peculiar customs. Conversely, our partial understanding of the significance of the dress and of the colors of paint employed by the Aztecs suggests the possibility, if indeed not the probability, of a similar or even identical meaning for the same dress and the same colors of paint as used among the Indians:³⁷

"Thursday, the 22 of *March*, was a very fayre warme day. About noone we met again about our publique businesse, but we had scarce beene an houre together, but *Samoset* came againe, and *Squanto* [= *Tisquantum*], the onely natiue of *Patuxat*, where we now inhabite, . . . with three others, and they brought with them some few skinnies to trucke, and some red Herings newly taken and dryed but not salted, and signified vnto vs, that their great Sagamore *Masasoyt* was hard by, with *Quadequina* his brother, and all their men. They could not well expresse in English what they would, but after an houre the King came to the top of an hill over against vs, and had in his trayne sixtie men, [so] that wee could well behold them, and they vs. We were not willing to send our governour to them, and they vnwilling to come to vs, so *Squanto* went againe vnto him, who brought word that wee should send one to parley with him, which we did, which was *Edward Winsloe*, to know his mind,

³⁷ One may most conveniently consult the so-called Codex Nuttall for comparison. Here, together with an excellent facsimile of the codex, one finds discriminating suggestions by Mrs. Zelia Nuttall upon the significance of dress and colors among the Aztecs.

and to signifie the mind and will of our governour, which was to haue trading and peace with him. We sent to the King a payre of Kniues, and a Copper Chayne, with a Iewell at it. To *Quadequina* we sent likewise a Knife and a Iewell to hang in his eare, and withall a Pot of strong water, a good quantitie of Bisket, and some butter, which were all willingly accepted. Our Messenger made a speech vnto him, [saying] that King IAMES saluted him with words of loue and Peace, and did accept of him as his Friend and Alie, and that our Governour desired to see him and to trucke with him, and to confirme a Peace with him, as his next neighbour. He liked well of the speech and heard it attentiuely, though the Interpreters did not well express it. After he had eaten and drunke himselfe and giuen the rest to his company, he looked vpon our messengers sword and armour which he had on, with intimation of his desire to buy it, but on the other side, our messenger shewed his vnwillingness to part with it. In the end he left him in the custodie of *Quadequina* his brother, and came over the brooke, and some twentie men following him, leaving all their Bowes and Arrowes behind them. We kept six or seaven as hostages for our messenger. Captaine *Standish* and master *Williamson* met the King at the brooke with halfe a dozen Musketiers. They saluted him and he them, so one going over, the one on the one side, and the other on the other, conducted him to an house then in building, where we placed a greene Rugge, and three or foure Cushions. Then instantly came our Governour with Drumme and Trumpet after him, and some few Musketiers. After salutations, our Governour kissing his hand, the King kissed him, and so they sat downe. The Governour called for some strong water and drunke to him, and he drunke a great draught that made him sweate all the while after. He called for a little fresh meate, which the King did eate willingly and did giue his followers. Then they treated of Peace, . . . all which the King seemed to like well, and it was applauded of his followers. All the while he sat by the Governour he trembled for feare. In his person he is a very lustie man, in his best yeares, an able body, graue of countenance, and spare of speech. In his Attire little or nothing differing from the rest of his followers, only in a great Chaine of white bone Beades about hie necke, and at it behinde his necke hangs a little bagg of Tobacco, which he dranke [*i.e.*, smoked] and gave vs to drinke. His face was paynted with a sad red like murry, and [he was] oyled both head and face, [so] that hee looked greasily. All his followers likewise were in their faces in part or in whole painted — some blacke, some red, some yellow, and some white, some with crosses and other Antick workes, some had skins on them,

and some [were] naked, all strong, all men in appearance. So after all was done, the Governour conducted him to the Brooke, and there they embraced each other and he departed. We diligently keeping our hostages, . . . expected our messengers comming, but anon word was brought vs, that *Quaddequina* was comming, and our messenger was stayed till his returne, who presently came and a troupe with him. So likewise wee entertained him, and conuayed him to the place prepared. He was very fearefull of our peeces, and made signes of dislike, that they should be carried away. Whereupon Commandement was given [that] they should be layd away. He was a very proper tall young man, of a very modest and seemly countenance, and he did kindly like of our entertainment. So we conuayed him likewise as wee did the King. . . . When hee was returned, then they dismissed our messenger. . . . One thing I³⁸ forgot. The King had in his bosome hanging in a string a great long knife. Hee marveled much at our Trumpet, and some of his men would sound it as well as they could. *Samoset* and *Squanto*, they stayed al night with vs, and the King and al his men lay all night in the woods not aboue halfe an English myle from vs, and all their wiues and women with them. They sayd that within 8 or 9 dayes they would come and set corne on the other side of the Brooke and dwell there all Summer, which is hard by vs.³⁹

Saturday and Sunday [March 17–27 and 18–28, 1621–22], reasonable fayre dayes. On this [Sun]day came againe the Savage, and brought with him fīue other tall proper men. They had every man a Deeres skin on him, and the principall [one] of them had a wild Cats skin, or such like on the one arme. They had most of them long hosen vp to their groynes, close made; and aboue their groynes to their wast another leather. They were altogether like the *Irish* trousers. They are of complexion like our English Gipseys — no haire or very little on their faces; on their heads long haire to their shoulders, onely cut before, some trussed vp before with a feather broad wise like a fanne. . . . These left . . . their Bowes and Arrowes a quarter of a myle from our Towne. . . . They made semblance vnto vs of friendship and amite; they song & danced after their maner . . . they brought with them in a thing like a Bowcase (which the principall [one] of them had about his wast) a little of their Corne powdered to Powder, which put to a little water they

³⁸ The word "I" suggests that one person wrote this narrative, and the word "Squanto," instead of Tisquantum, a line or two below indicates that that person was William Bradford.

³⁹ Bradford, *Relation*, pp. 35–38.

eat. He had a little Tobacco in a bag, but none of them drunke [= smoked] but when he listed. Some of them had their faces paynted black from the forehead to the chin foure or five fingers broad; others after other fashion, as they liked.”⁴⁰

Winslow, who had been a printer in London, seems to have been known as a physician among the Indians and to have become rather better acquainted with them than the other colonists. His book, *Good Newes*, 1624, indeed, is very largely taken up with picturesque and entertaining accounts of the life of the Indians and of the Pilgrims' experiences among them. The following incident may be cited here:

“After[ward] wee came to a Towne of *Massasoyts*, where we eat [= ate] Oysters and other fish. From thence we went to *Packano-kick*, but *Massasoyt* was not at home. There we stayed, he being sent for. . . . *Massasoyt* being come, wee discharged our Peeces and saluted him, who after their manner kindly well commend vs and tooke vs into his house and set vs downe by him, where having delivered our foresayd Message and Presents, and having put the Coat on his backe and the Chayne about his necke, he was not a little proud to behold himselfe, and his men also to see their King so brauely attyred. . . . This being ended, he lighted Tobacco for vs and fell to discoursing of *England* & of the Kings Maiestie, marvayling that he would liue without a wife. . . . Late it grew, but victualls he offered none, for indeed he had not any, [the reason] being [that] he came so newly home. So we desired to goe to rest. He layd vs on the bed with himselfe and his wife, they at the one end and we at the other, it being onely plancks layd a foot from the ground and a thin Mat vpon them. Two more of his chiefe men for want of roome pressed by and vpon vs, so that we were worse weary of our lodging then of our iourney.

The next day being Thursday many of their Sachims or petty Governours came to see vs, and many of their men also. There they went to their manner of Games for skins and kniues. There we challenged them to shoote with them for skins, but they durst not. . . . About one a-clocke *Massasoyt* brought two fishes that he had shot. They were like Breame but three times so bigge, and better

⁴⁰ Probably not as they liked, but according to their rank or standing in the tribe. Bradford, *Relation*, p. 34.

meate. These being boyled there were at le[a]st fortie [that] looked for [a] share in them [and] the most eate [= ate] of them. This meale onely we had in two nights and a day, and had not one of vs b[r]ought a Partridge, we had taken our Iourney fasting. Very importunate he was to haue vs stay with them longer, but wee desired to keepe the Sabbath at home, and feared we should . . . be light-headed for want of sleepe, for what with bad lodging, the Savage barbarous singing (for they vse to sing themselues asleepe), lice and fleas within doores, and Muskeetoos without, we could hardly sleepe all the time of our being there, we much fearing that if wee should stay any longer, we should not be able to recover home for want of strength, so that on the Fryday morning before Sun-rising we tooke our leaue and departed, *Massasoyt* being both grieved and ashamed that he could no better entertaine vs.”⁴¹

One's interest is always aroused by the early statements concerning the primitive religion of the Indians. Winslow appears to have devoted some time to the subject. According to his later statements it would seem that they were familiar with the idea of one supreme God above all their minor gods, whom they called Kiehtan. Thomas Morton in his *New English Canaan* (Amsterdam, 1637) presents still further particulars as to the native religion, and by giving a different spelling for the name of this divinity, Kytan, makes its certain how it should be properly pronounced. According to his belief, the Indians were also familiar with the tradition of a flood, and were “perswaded that Kytan is hee that makes corne growe, trees growe, and all manner of fruits”:⁴²

“A few things I thought meet to adde hereunto which I haue obserued amongst the *Indians*, both touching their Religion and sundry other Customes amongst them. And first, whereas my selfe and others in former Lettres (which came to the Presse against my will and knowledge) wrote that the *Indians* about vs are a people without any Religion or knowledge of any God, therein I erred, though we could then gather no better, for as they conceiue of many

⁴¹ Relation, pp. 44-46 (section by Winslow).

⁴² By this last statement it might appear that the Indians worshipped the sun under this name; but Winslow says that no man had ever seen Kiehtan.

divine powers, so of one whom they call *Kiehtan* to be the principall and maker of all the rest and to be made by none. He (they say) created the heavens, earth, sea, and all creatures contained therein; also that he made one man and one woman of whom they and wee and all mankinde came; but how they became so farre dispersed, that know they not. At first they say, there was no *Sachim* or *King* but *Kiehtan* who dwelleth aboue in the Heavens, whither all good men goe when they die to see their friends and haue their fill of all things. This his habitation lyeth farre Westward in the heavens, they say. Thither the bad men goe also and knoeke at his doore, but he bids them *Quatchet*, that is to say, Walke abroad, for there is no place for such, so that they wander in restles want and penury. Never man saw this *Kiehtan*; onely old men tell them of him and bid them tell their children, yea to charge them to teach their posterities the same and lay the like charge vpon them. This power they acknowledge to be good, and when they would obtaine any great matter, meete together and cry vnto him, and so likewise for plentie, victorie, &c., sing, daunce, feast, giue thanks, and hang vp Garlandes and other things in memorie of the same.⁴³ Although these Salvages are found to be without Religion, Law, and King (as Sir William Alexander hath well observed,) yet are they not altogether without the knowledge of God (historically) for they haue it amongst them by tradition, that God made one man and one woman, and had them live together, and get children, kill deare, beasts, birds, fish, and fowle, and what they would at their pleasure; and that their posterity was full of evil, and made God so angry that hee let in the Sea upon them, & drowned the greatest part of them, that were naughty men (the Lord destroyed so.). And they went to Sanaconquam, who feeds upon them (pointing to the Center of the Earth, where they imagine is the habitation of the Devil); the other, which were not destroyed, increased the world; and when they died (because they were good) went to the howse of Kytan (pointing to the setting of the sonne), where they eate all manner of dainties, and never take paines (as now) to provide it.⁴⁴

Kytan makes provision (they say) and saves them that laboure, and there they shall live with him forever voyd of care. And they are perswaded that Kytan is hee that makes corne growe, trees growe, and all manner of fruits.

Many sacrifices the *Indians* vse, and in some cases kill children. It seemeth they are various in their religious worship in a little dis-

⁴³ Edward Winslow, *Good Newes*, pp. 52, 53.

⁴⁴ Thomas Morton, *New English Canaan*, Amsterdam, 1637, pp. 45-50.

tance and grow more and more cold in their worship to *Kiehtan*; saying in their memory hee was much more called vpon. The *Nanohiggansets* [= Narragansetts] excede in their blinde devotion and haue a great spacious house wherein onely some few (that are as wee may tearme them Priests) come. Thither at certaine knowne times resort all their people and offer almost all the riches they haue to their gods, as kettles, skinnes, hatchets, beads, kniues, &c., all which are cast by the Priests into a great fire that they make in the midst of the house and there consumed to ashes. To this offering euery man bringeth freely, and the more hee is knowne to bring hath the better esteeme of all men. This the other Indians about vs aproue of as good and wish their *Sachims* would appoint the like.”⁴⁵

The fact that the Indians, like the Aztecs, sometimes sacrificed human beings suggests that their traditions must have descended to them from a very remote period.⁴⁶ The account of the “spacious house” mentioned in the last passage, wherein the priests of the Narragansetts were accustomed to build a great fire, into which the people cast at certain times as offerings of sacrifice their kettles, skins, hatchets, beads, knives, etc., reminds one also of the charred and broken remains of similar articles found in recent years beneath certain of the Ohio mounds constructed by the so-called Mound Builders.

Here we may conclude our study of these early accounts of Plymouth Plantation. Other points, indeed, relating both to the Pilgrims and to the Indians might be discussed, but I shall be satisfied if this paper shall once more call attention to, and stimulate interest in, the valuable archæological information contained in these narratives, and the desirability of undertaking further archæological investigations, before it is absolutely too late, in the neighborhood of Plymouth and upon Cape Cod.

⁴⁵ Edward Winslow, *Good Newes*, p. 55.

⁴⁶ One is reminded of the frequent references by classical authors to the fact that Kronos or Saturn, the reputed father of Zeus or Jupiter, ruled in the West; and that he is said to have required human sacrifices in his worship.

PLYMOUTH'S DEBT TO THE INDIANS

LINCOLN N. KINNICUTT

WORCESTER

In considering the relations of the early settlers of Massachusetts and the Indians it is greatly to be regretted that the Red Men possessed no civilized method by which they could leave a record of their own ideas, their own thoughts, and their own reasons for their actions, and that consequently nothing has survived except through tradition or through the medium of records compiled and written by the invaders of their country. All that we really know is the White Man's version; he has always been the judge, the jury, and the advocate for the plaintiff, all in one. The defense has had no means of being heard except through the plaintiff's lawyers, whose knowledge, even of the Indian language, was very slight. Certainly a unique trial. When we stop for a few minutes in our present energetic, busy, hurrying everyday life, and consider the luxury in which we now live, our comfortable homes, our variety of food, our steam cars, our motor cars, our telegraph and telephone, all of which we now demand as necessities and as our lawful rights, it is almost impossible to realize that three hundred years ago in this same land, in our own Massachusetts, for one winter and more or less for two years, our ancestors were absolutely dependent on the Indians for food sufficient to sustain life.

An anecdote from Mr. James Fletcher's *History of the Town of Plymouth*, which I quote, is perhaps the Indian idea of the earliest relations between the two races.

"In the year 1789 a number of Indians, assembled in New York on a mission to President Washington, were invited to dinner by General Knox, Secretary of War. A little before dinner two or three of

the Sachems, with their chief or principal men, went into the balcony at the front of the house from which they had a view of the city, the harbor, Long Island, and the adjacent country. They appeared dejected, and General Knox noticing this said to the Chief, 'Brother, what has happened to you? You look sorry. Is there anything here to make you unhappy?' He answered, 'I will tell you, Brother. I have been looking at your beautiful city, the great water and rivers, your mighty, fine country, producing enough for all your wants. See how happy you all are. But then I could not help thinking that this fine country and this great water was once ours. Our ancestors once lived here, they enjoyed it as their own possession in peace; it was the gift of the Great Spirit to them and their children. At length the white people came here in a great canoe. They asked only to let them tie it to a tree, lest the waters should carry it away. We consented. They then said some of their people were sick, and they asked permission to land them, and put them under the shade of the trees. The ice then came, and they could not get away. They then begged a piece of land to build wigwams for the winter; we granted it to them. They then asked for some corn to keep them from starving; we kindly furnished it to them, they promising to go away when the ice was gone. When this happened and the great water was clear, we told them they must now go away with their big canoe; but they pointed to their big guns around their wigwams and said they would stay there and we could not make them go away. Afterwards more white people came. They brought spirituous and intoxicating liquors with them, of which the Indians became very fond. They persuaded us to sell them some land. Finally they drove us back from time to time into the wilderness, far from the water and the fish and the oysters. They destroyed the game; our people have wasted away, and now we live miserable and wretched, while you are enjoying our fine and beautiful country. This it is that makes me sorry, Brother, and I cannot help it.'

The earliest relations established between the Indians and the colonists had, from the standpoint of the settlers, only two objects in view — self-protection and personal gain; personal, as applied to the various units of colonization as they were attempted. When the welfare and prosperity of the Englishman had been practically assured, then the spiritual welfare of the Indian became an important factor in the relation between the two races; but

the material welfare alone of the Indian was not then considered, except by comparatively few, and it never has been otherwise.

Although the Pilgrims came to the new world for the freedom of worship, even their relations with the Indians were founded, through necessity, on personal gain, as well as on personal safety. Their leaders possessed little worldly wealth, and they had committed themselves to send back to England the valuable commodities which were supposed to be obtained easily in the "Paradise of all these Parts" — so called by Captain John Smith — in order to compensate those from whom they had been obliged to seek financial aid and who had given it only from speculative motives. Without this aid from the "Merchant Adventurers" (and the name itself defines their understanding of the situation), of whom Thomas Weston was the treasurer, the whole project would necessarily have been abandoned, at least for the time being. Their creditors were hard taskmasters, as is shown by a harsh, unjust letter written by Thomas Weston about seven months after their landing, stating that "the life of the business depends on the lading of this ship." Governor Carver, to whom this letter was written, had died some months before its arrival at Plymouth, and the reply which Governor Bradford wrote shows how pitiful was the whole situation of the colonists. The result, however, was that still harsher terms were insisted upon by the business partners of the enterprise.

Pilgrims, freedom of worship, merchant-adventurers, beaver skins, sassafras, and codfish — and the Indians! No ideal situation, surely.

It would almost seem that Plymouth was predestined to become the Mecca of the New World (to which all good Americans make pilgrimage), and that the Pilgrims were the chosen people, so many apparently accidental events occurred many years before their landing which

were of vital importance to the survival of the colony, and during the first two years such critical situations owed their fortunate solutions to apparently accidental causes. It was the result of accidental events, which took place before 1620, that made it possible for the Pilgrims to come to a better and more equitable understanding with the Indians than was obtained by any of the other early colonists, and also made it possible for a longer continuance of this relationship.

Plymouth owes its existence, in my opinion, to two Indians, and possibly to a third, Massasoit, Tisquantum (or Squanto as he is more generally known), and Hobomok. They have never been given their rightful place in the history of our country. Of Tisquantum Charles Francis Adams wrote, "If human instruments are ever prepared by special Providence for a given work, he was assuredly so prepared for his." It was through the influence of these three men alone that any mutual understanding or relationship was created and maintained between the Indians and the Pilgrims, and to the three the Pilgrims were indebted, certainly during the early years, for their food, their existence, and even their lives. Something of Indian history must be told in order to understand how events had shaped themselves or fate had intervened (call it what you will) to achieve the desired end.

For some years before and at the time of the Plymouth settlement, five different confederacies, each having its own territory and each governed by its own chiefs, occupied a large part of New England, not including Maine. The Pawtuckets peopled southern New Hampshire, the Pequots the eastern part of Connecticut, the Narragansetts Rhode Island and certain islands, the Massachusetts the country about Massachusetts Bay, and the Pokanokets a large part of the counties of Bristol, Plymouth, Barnstable, and a part of Worcester county and exercised some authority in Nantucket and Martha's

Vineyard. The Pokanokets included at least nine separate tribes, each governed by its own Sagamore, but all subject to one grand Sachem who was also the principal chief of the Wampanoag tribe, living about Mount Hope (Montaup), and he was Massasoit. The principal occupations of the Indian men were hunting, fishing, and fighting, while the women cultivated the fields. And there was no continuance of peace in the whole land.

Four or five years before the coming of the Pilgrims the Indians suffered terribly from a strange and unidentified epidemic which spread over a large part of the Massachusetts coast and was felt most severely in Cape Cod Bay. It was so very fatal among the Indians of the Pawtuxet tribe, a tributary of the Pokanokets, who inhabited the land in and about Plymouth, that they were practically annihilated, leaving their land vacant and uninhabited, ready and waiting for new inhabitants. It was this land that Massasoit practically gave to Governor Bradford for the new colony.

Two months elapsed after the landing of the Pilgrims at Plymouth before they came into close contact with any large number of the natives. The Indians, however, had been keeping close watch, and it is believed from circumstantial evidence, had been consulting together on what course to pursue and what relationship on their part should be established. Governor Bradford states in his *History of the Plymouth Colony*, "Before they" (the Indians) "came to ye English to make friendship they gott all the Powachs of ye cuntrie for 3 days together in a horid and devellish maner to curse & execrate them with their conjurations, which asembly & service they held in a darke & dismale swampe." This was the colonists' version of what probably was a Grand Council of all the tribes of the Pokanoket Confederacy, for before deciding any question pertaining to peace or war it was the custom among the Indians to call such a council. In the "dark

and dismal swampe" was assembled probably the first Congress of Americans to consult on foreign relations.

No record of what actually took place was ever written or known, but imagination can paint the picture: A forest council-chamber of which nature alone was the architect, with wigwams scattered among the tall pines, and the light of camp fires partially dispelling the almost impenetrable darkness of the woods and swamps and making weird shadows of the swaying branches of the leafless trees; the Indians wrapped in their blankets seated as age or rank prescribed around a great fire, passing the ceremonial pipe, and harkening to the conjurations and lurid spells with which their medicine men exorcised the Pale Faces, and then listening to the advice of their Sachems and their Sagamores. Neither they nor their chiefs could realize or even imagine the fateful consequences of this decision to themselves as well as to the colonists.

Massasoit was the great Sachem ruling over all that part of Massachusetts. He was a noble and wise chief, and on his decision and action depended the relations which should prevail. His ability, his wisdom, his justice, and his loyalty were always acknowledged by the Pilgrims, and as good a relationship and friendship as could possibly exist between two races whose objects were so diametrically opposed, was created and established by him. I believe that during the two months of apparent inactivity on the part of the Indians, Massasoit knew well all that took place among the Pilgrims, as well as among the Indians, and before that memorable first meeting on Watson Hill, he had decided what course he thought best and wished to pursue.

That first meeting was too important in respect to what its consequences might be not to have been in a measure previously conceived by the Indians. The terms of the treaty then signed, that embryo League of Nations

between the nine Indian tribes owning Massasoit as their Sachem, and the Pilgrims, subjects of King James, was so Indian-like, so simple and yet so powerful in its material, direct conditions, that although it may have been indited by Governor Carver it must have been conceived, although perhaps vaguely, by Massasoit. It was completed, agreed to, with no reservations, and executed in half a day. But that was three hundred years ago.

I think we have always underestimated the mental capacity of many of the great chiefs of the American primitive race before it was "civilized." How would a desired understanding of like nature be conceived or consummated today? There would be more diplomacy, more necessary safeguarding, more controversy and less sincerity, less honor and more delay, but the same fundamental ideas and methods would prevail.

Samoset, as a messenger, appeared with his salutation of welcome to the strangers, and remained a whole day and night, giving and obtaining all possible information. The next day he returned with five companions, subjects of Massasoit's own tribe, possibly to confirm the reports of the first messenger, for Samoset was of a northern tribe and was probably selected on account of his rank, although not of the Wampanoag tribe, and for his partial knowledge of the language of the white men. These messengers announced the near presence of their King and made way for his coming, and then four or five days later Massasoit himself appeared with a retinue of sixty subjects, bringing with him Squanto, an Indian who knew the English language and the English people better probably than any Indian in the whole country. Presents were exchanged, and after some ceremonies were observed a treaty was confirmed, and a peace and a friendship were established which lasted more than fifty years and as long as Massasoit lived.

The treaty is impressive in its simplicity and brevity, and yet it contains all necessary provisions for good relationship and states clearly in seven short articles all that was required. Only two of these articles stipulated any reciprocal action on the part of the Pilgrims, but one of these, the fourth, read as follows: "That if any did unjustly war against him [Massasoit], they [the Pilgrims] would aid him; and if any did war against them, he should aid them" (A requirement in most treaties, but seldom so plainly understandable).

This was probably the one essential condition that influenced Massasoit, for his confederacy had been much weakened, having been reduced by the epidemic, as is supposed, from three thousand fighting men to five hundred, and with the neighboring confederacy on the west, the Narragansetts, he was continually at war. They had escaped the ravages of the plague and were stronger than ever, and he recognized, to a certain extent, the power of the English and wished to seize the opportunity of obtaining so promising an ally; also he may have had ambitions for a greater and more extended power.

Fortunate it was for the Pilgrims and fortunate it was for the Indians that the new colony possessed such men as Carver, Bradford, Miles Standish, and Winslow. They understood and respected Massasoit, and by their personality were able to make Massasoit respect and partially understand them. He admired and approved of their stern and harsh justice, and was impressed by, although not understanding, their many merciful actions and decisions. Through this mutual friendly relationship the colonists probably escaped a massacre similar to that which befell the Virginia Colony in 1622, in which nearly four hundred white men were killed in a single day, and probably postponed until 1665, several years after Massasoit's death, a King Philip's war, which the united colonists were then strong enough to defeat.

Although Massasoit himself was never a convert, to a certain extent he prepared the ground unconsciously for Reverend John Eliot and Daniel Gookin, who many years after the making of the treaty attempted their good work of converting the Indians. In 1639, when renewing the compact and bringing his oldest son, Wamsutta (Alexander), to join with him in the renewal, he endeavored to make his allies agree to leave to his people their own religious faith. As the English expressed it, "He wished to bind us never to draw away any of his people from their old pagan superstition and devilish idoltry to the Christian religion." He died faithful and loyal to his allies, to his religion and his God.

Although the story of Tisquantum (Squanto) has often been told, I must refer briefly to several incidents in his life and recall a part of his history, in order to make clear the process of the shaping of the corner stone on which rested, certainly at first, the desired relationship between the Pilgrims and the Indians. His mission in life seems to have been the welfare of the colonists, and his training to prepare him for this work apparently began fifteen years before the arrival of the Mayflower. His adventures and narrow escapes are almost incredible. He was a native of Patuxet, the Indian name of Plymouth, and he belonged to the Pokanoket tribe. If we are to believe Sir Ferdinando Gorges, he was kidnapped by Captain Weymouth, who happened to come into Plymouth in 1605 on his voyage to the Penobscot, "from whence he brought five of the natives, one of whose names was Tisquantum"; and Sir Ferdinando Gorges also states that he had Tisquantum with him for three years in London.

Captain John Smith in his *Second Voyage to New England* writes: "The main assistance, next God . . . was my acquaintance amongst the saluages, especially with Dohoday, one of their greatest Lords, who had liued long in England, and another called Tantum I (had) carried

with mee from England and set on shore at Cape Cod." Among historians Gorges' statements in regard to Squanto have created much controversy as to their accuracy; but Captain John Smith's narrative appears partially to confirm them, for other notes seem to identify Tantum with Tisquantum. We know certainly that in 1614 he was kidnapped (for the first or second time) by Captain Thomas Hunt with a number of other Indians and taken to Malaga, where Captain Hunt tried to sell his captives for slaves, but was prevented by the priests, who took possession of the savages in order to convert them. It is not known how Squanto got to England; but in the beginning of 1615 he was living with a Mr. John Slany in Cornhill or Cheapside and remained two years, and then in some manner found his way to Newfoundland and there met Captain Thomas Dermer. Dermer was impressed by his account and his knowledge of Cape Cod and Plymouth and wrote to Sir Ferdinando Gorges, in whose interests he was associated, "of the good use that might be made of his employment"; with the result that Captain Dermer took Squanto with him again to England. Gorges almost immediately sent Squanto with Captain Dermer back again to New England, wishing to use him in his own colonization scheme, and the "Saluages own country" was their destination. So after many years' wandering Squanto was returned to his native place, Plymouth. It was a sad home-coming, for not one of his own tribe was alive. All had been swept away by the plague.

This was the summer of 1619, and Squanto probably passed the following winter on the coast of Maine. But in the summer of 1620 he was again at Cape Cod; for according to Bradford he was with Dermer at Martha's Vineyard when in a conflict with the Indians Dermer was mortally wounded and all in his party killed, with the exception of one man. Bradford does not state that this one survivor was Squanto, but from inference it must have

been he. This was only a few months before the landing of the Pilgrims, and there are reasons for believing that under instructions from Sir Ferdinando Gorges Captain Dermer and Squanto were in this locality in order to intercept them, for if the plans of the Pilgrims had not miscarried, they would have reached their destination in the autumn.

In March, 1620 (o. s.), Squanto came with Massasoit as an interpreter, probably the only Indian who, prepared as he was by strange experiences, could convey to both parties a clear understanding of what each desired. It is natural to suppose that Massasoit would take advantage of Squanto's knowledge of the white man, for Squanto was one of his own subjects, and could tell him much of their numbers, of their power, and of their habits, and it must have influenced him somewhat in regard to the relations best to be established.

After the treaty was made Squanto remained with the Pilgrims, either by order of Massasoit or by his own wish, and became an indispensable factor in the life of the little colony, for, quoting Governor Bradford again, "Squanto continued with them and was their interpretor, and was a spetiall instrument sent of God for their good beyond their expectation. He directed them how to set their corne, wher to take fish and to procure other commodities, and was also their pilott to bring them to unknowne places for their profitt, and never left them till he dyed. He was a native of this place, & scarce any left alive besids him selfe." Corbitant, a Sachem, an ally of the Narragansetts and an enemy of the English, wishing to kill him, said, "If he were dead, the English had [*i.e.*, would have] lost their tongue."

Squanto lived less than two years after his coming to the Pilgrims, and died in their service on an expedition to procure corn, of which the colony was in sore need. When dying he "desired the Governor to pray for him that he

might go to the Englishman's God in heaven, and bequeathed sundry of his things to sundry of his English friends as remembrance of his love; of whom they had great loss."

It would almost seem that Squanto's whole mission in life was fulfilled in these two short years, by giving that service which he alone could render to the founders of New England. When we remember that to prepare this savage for his task he was the only one of his whole tribe to escape death from the plague, that he was sold as a slave and was obliged to live in a strange land for many years, that he was sent back and forth across the Atlantic Ocean, and that he was saved from violent death at the hands of his own kindred, we stop and consider and ponder, and cannot help but realize that in this world of ours a guiding hand directs.

A few months after the treaty was made and before the death of Squanto the Plymouth colony was joined by Hobomok, an Indian from Massasoit's own tribe, the Wampanoags, who was held in high esteem by Massasoit. His coming proved to be of great value to the Pilgrims in maintaining the established relations, especially after Squanto's death. Much jealousy always existed between Squanto and Hobomok, which although very beneficial to the colonists, because each of the twain was striving ambitiously to make himself the more important, nearly resulted in costing Squanto his life. Hobomok was able apparently to prove that Squanto had made false statements in regard to Massasoit's loyalty, and Massasoit, learning of this, declared Squanto to be his enemy and demanded that by the terms of the treaty he should be delivered to him to be dealt with as he thought best. This meant that Squanto would be beheaded. Governor Bradford endeavored in vain to evade this demand, for he appreciated to how great an extent the colonists were indebted to Squanto and that they could ill spare him;

but finally, true to the spirit of the contract, he agreed to accede.

Squanto, knowing this decision and his probable fate, then proved his strong character. He went to the Governor, not attempting to flee, "and accused Hobomok as the author and worker of his overthrow, yielding himself to the Governor to be sent or not, as he thought meet." But at the instant he was to be delivered to his executioners, a boat was seen outside the harbor, and deeming that it might be a vessel from France Governor Bradford told the messengers who had been sent for Squanto he must first know what this boat was before delivering him into their custody. The Indians, angry and impatient at the delay, departed, and thus once again Squanto's life was spared. For some unexplainable reason the demand was not repeated, and Winslow states that before September of the same year peace had been wrought between Massasoit and Squanto. As an Indian characteristic is never to forgive or forget an injury, this occurrence remains still more unexplainable.

One of the most critical periods in the life of the colony was in the winter and early spring of 1622-23 (o. s.). The Plymouth colony in aiding the Weston colony at Wessagusset (Weymouth) had depleted its own stores and was obliged to depend largely on the Indians for its supply of corn. The relations between the Wessagusset colony and the Massachusetts Indians had always been antagonistic, and now, through that colony's own evil doing, was nearly at the breaking point. The Massachusetts tribe and the Narragansett tribe, realizing the weakened condition of the Weston colony, were endeavoring to influence some of the Pokanoket tribes to unite with them and massacre all the white men in both colonies.

At this time two incidents occurred, very dissimilar in their nature but each of vital importance, which serve as faithful witnesses to testify to the true relationship and

even friendship which existed between the Pilgrims and the Indians who acknowledged Massasoit as their Chief.

In March, 1622 (o. s.), news came to Plymouth that Massasoit was very ill. The Pilgrims, knowing it was a custom among the Indians that all who professed friendship to a dying chief should visit him in person or send some accredited messenger, decided it would be a friendly and humane act to observe the custom and possibly render aid. Therefore Winslow and one companion, with Hobomok as a guide, started immediately for Packanokik where Massasoit was. It was a long, hard journey of forty miles over the frozen forest trails and through swamps and streams, and was taken with the knowledge that probably they would be too late. They found, however, that Massasoit was still alive but unable even to recognize them. Fortunately Winslow had brought with him remedies which he thought might be of service, and he sent back a messenger to Plymouth for other medicines. By his prompt action and skilful treatment he undoubtedly saved Massasoit's life and he remained with him until he was entirely out of danger. Massasoit, before Winslow's return to Plymouth, expressed himself in these words, "Now I see the English are my friends and love me; and whilst I live I will never forget the kindness they have showed me."

This good action on the part of the Pilgrims received its own reward much sooner than experience has taught humanity to expect, for on their journey back to Plymouth Hobomok delivered to Winslow a message of advice which Massasoit had instructed him to give, in order that Governor Bradford should be informed immediately on their arrival at home. This message revealed the plot of the Massachusetts Indians, before spoken of, against Master Weston's colony and so against the Pilgrim colony. He [Massasoit] named seven tribes who had joined with them, and also said that he himself "was earnestly so-

licited, but he would neither join therein nor give way to any of his." He advised Governor Bradford, if he respected the lives of his countrymen or his own safety, to kill the men of the Massachusetts who were the authors of this intended mischief. He also advised him to strike first and not wait until they began, or Bradford would rue the delay.

Governor Bradford, on receiving this message, called the Pilgrim company together and informed them of Massasoit's message and advice. It was decided that Captain Miles Standish should go immediately to Wessagusset with as many men as he might select but enough to make the Massachusetts tribe powerless, to strike first and to bring back the head of Wituwamat, their Chief, as a warning to the other hostile Indians. No other than Miles Standish could have been entrusted with this all-important undertaking. He was their military commander, and no man could have been better equipped for it. Charles Francis Adams, analyzing his character, says, "He seems to have been gifted by nature with a quick ear as well as eye. . . . His instinct told him, and told him correctly, how a savage should be dealt with, and he seems never to have made a mistake. . . . Seeing what the occasion called for, he did not hesitate." He took with him eight of the Pilgrim company and Hobomok.

It is needless to repeat the happenings of these eventful few days, for Edward Winslow in his *Relation* has vividly depicted the minute details. But I will recall that scene of the final encounter, when with about an equal number of men Miles Standish and Wituwamat, the Sachem of the Massachusetts, met in a small room of one of the log cabins at Wessagusset. Miles Standish with his few followers, all brave and determined, although weakened by a winter of hunger and privation; Wituwamat, who only a day or two previously had audaciously sharpened his knife before Standish, and flourishing it, had pointed to

a woman's face carved on the handle and had boasted that he had another knife on which a man's face would soon be carved and the two would marry; and Peksuut, an Indian who, boasting of his great size and strength, had taunted Standish with his small stature — the Indians in their picturesque costumes, and the Pilgrims in dilapidated and worn clothing — all watching for that favorable moment which, although unrecognized, was so momentous in deciding the fate of the colony. It made a historic picture to be remembered by all Pilgrim descendants.

Miles Standish followed Massasoit's advice. He struck first. No guns were used, only the familiar weapon of the savage, the knife. No quarter was asked nor given. The English knew they were fighting for the future existence of the whole colony, and the Indians, although they did not know, were fighting for their homes and for the lands that Manito, their God, had given them. It was the old story of the progress of civilization, the survival of the fittest; and the Englishmen won. Wituwamat, Peksuut, and another Indian were killed, a brother of Wituwamat was taken prisoner and immediately hung, and the next day the remainder of the Massachusetts tribe either fled or were killed.

That "first stroke" delivered by Standish was a bold, hazardous stroke. It was as essential as the kindly visit to Massasoit in order to make secure the foundation upon which was being laid the structure of peace and understanding and friendly relationship between the Pilgrims and the Indian Pokanoket confederacy. The treaty had been sanctified by blood and by mercy, and it endured for almost fifty years, until many of those who had made it had gone to the Happy Hunting Ground.

Such is the history, briefly told, of the relations of the Pilgrims and the Indians for the first two years of the life of the Pilgrim colony. On a tablet at Plymouth should be

written the names of Massasoit, Squanto, and Hobomok, Indians only, but men worthy to be in company with Carver, Bradford, Miles Standish, and Winslow. Squanto died in their service, Hobomok remained faithful and devoted to their welfare until his death, and Massasoit, living many years, was true and loyal to the last.

THEOLOGY AND ROMANTICISM

HERBERT L. STEWART

DALHOUSIE UNIVERSITY, HALIFAX, NOVA SCOTIA

The widespread reaction towards the Church of Rome by which the first half of the last century was marked, has been subjected to a multitude of more or less intelligent explanations. It was to be expected from poor human nature that each critic should explain in accordance with that law of human development which he had himself embraced, and in illustration of that moral which he deemed it most salutary to draw. In this field the disciple of Bossuet will be forever at issue with the disciple of Comte. From the one we hear how the eyes of Europe had been providentially opened by long years of anarchy and bloodshed, how the spirit of schism had been at length unmasked, how the exhausted nations were taught once more to value a unified spiritual control, and how amid the wreck of thrones and the desolation of kingdoms the very dullest of mankind must have been awed by the spectacle of the Chair of Peter standing fast, an authentic token of the Mighty Hand and the Outstretched Arm. From the other side we listen to the cold comment that world disasters are apt to drive back the less robust sort of mind to the solace of old superstition, that mental progress like all things human has its ebb and flow, and that we need not be surprised if a season of shivering credulity alternates with a season of fearless rationalism. The philosophic historian may well be left to wear himself out in this profitless debate with the brethren of his own craft. *Non nostri est tantas componere lites.*

But there is a side to the question which should repay more serious thought than it commonly receives. The recoil towards Rome was not merely a fact of history. It

was associated with a new and very suggestive type of theological and philosophical thinking, a type which extended itself far beyond the bounds of the Roman communion. Histories of literature dismiss the subject with the abrupt remark that we have here yet another aspect of the many-sided "Romanticism." But historians of literature are too seldom either philosophers or theologians, and they have left this very fruitful germ of thought quite undeveloped. No one could fail to suspect a common principle in two movements that were so nearly contemporaneous, that left so deep a mark upon just the same quarters of Europe, and that in so many cases were promoted by precisely the same men. Yet the common principle needs to be defined and limited with great care, unless it is to confuse rather than illumine the twin impulses, literary and religious, which it thus brings into relation.

For the *prima facie* resemblances are not more striking than the *prima facie* differences. For example, one could not select three men more typical of the Romantic spirit than Rousseau in France, Frederick Schlegel in Germany, and Coleridge in England. The religion of Jean Jacques was changed more than once, and whether we take as its characteristic expression the mystical reverences of the Savoyard vicar or the proposed State establishment of deism in the *Contrat Social*, we can detect little sign of renewed homage to the Holy See. It was as the author of *Lucinde*, the companion of the divorced Dorothea, and the bold apologist of *mariage á quatre*, that Schlegel was acclaimed by the Romanticists of Jena; not an auspicious beginning, one would say, for him who would re-subjugate the moral disorders of Protestantism to the government of an infallible Church. And if there is one tenet which, more constantly than any other, was proclaimed and emphasized by Coleridge, it was that of England's unique blessing among the distracted peoples of the Continent,

in her spiritual heritage of the Reformed faith. Nor does the later growth of the Romantic school in any one of these countries lend unqualified support to the view that it made for religious reaction. If in France it was championed by a Chateaubriand, it also found representatives in a de Musset, a Lamartine, and a Hugo. If in Germany it explains Stolberg and Tieck, it must also bear the load of Heine and Schopenhauer. If in England we count in its train a Wordsworth and a Keble, we must not omit a Shelley and a Swinburne.

Not less notable is the fact that Romantic influence was at work in the so-called "Broad" section of the Protestant churches. Schleiermacher was at least as much determined by it towards his religious individualism, his suspicion of mere intellect, and his reliance upon the data of feeling, as de Maistre towards a system of spiritual authority, under which the individual is controlled, reason monopolized, and the feelings often held in such restraint as to be virtually suppressed. A hundred years ago in the English Church the heresy that looks towards Rationalism was far oftener traced to Romantic sources than the heresy that looks towards Rome. The new ideas by which Maurice and his circle appalled one side and revived another within the Anglican establishment had been mediated to themselves by Coleridge, but Coleridge's ultimate inspiration was in Königsberg and Jena.

Thus the threads are obviously tangled. At first sight it seems no less easy to maintain that a Romanticist as such would favor the liberal than that he would favor the conservative side in theological development. And if any general conclusion is to be reached, it must be by way of a very cautious analysis. One might almost predict that two results will follow: first, that Romanticism will reveal within itself elements not all of which were found in any single Romanticist, and of which some tended to reaction while others tended to progress; and, second,

that the common element, present in all Romanticists alike to whom the name is properly applied, acted in furtherance of that which modern liberal and modern conservative theology cherish alike. This may sound a truism. But I trust to be able to show that the historical considerations by which it is confirmed, so far from being truisms, are as yet quite insufficiently recognized as truths.

I

Romanticism had its birth before the eighteenth century closed; yet if we describe it as "the revolt of the nineteenth century against the eighteenth," we shall have spoken with a larger degree of justice than is usually compressed into an epigram. No doubt nature never makes a leap, and the zealots for continuity can point to many a foreshadowing of what was to come in the spiritual tendencies that were passing out of sight. But the passage marked by the calendar has seldom corresponded with such exactness to a real change of epoch. Three new ideas were especially in the air, and each of them was represented in some form by writers of the Romantic school. There was a startling and widely prevalent distrust in the strength of human reason. There was an immensely deepened interest in the past, and at least the beginning of a far more adequate appreciation of history. And there was the assertion as a definite principle of the trustworthiness of feeling, of instinct, of the "impulses of the heart," against dialectic, ratiocination, intellectual "proof" or "disproof."

In 1829 Carlyle wrote *Signs of the Times*, in which he reproached his age as having become utterly mechanical, as having lost its capacity for wonder, and as pinning its faith to empirical science. But John Stuart Mill had a far deeper insight into the time when he declared two rival forces to be working in English thought — Jeremy Bentham as the apostle of progress, and Coleridge as the

exponent of the "wisdom contained in the sacred traditions of the race." In the end the conservative influence proved no less significant than the radical. The two great Romantic poets who collaborated in the production of *Lyrical Ballads* were at once the representatives and the stimulators of a profound disbelief both in the perfecting of the world through science and in the salvation of souls through philosophy.

The general literature of the period has an unmistakable tone of despair both about the possibilities of higher knowledge and about the value of knowledge for life. Multitudes felt with Coleridge that metaphysic had become like the trees in the shadowy world of Vergil, bearing a dream upon every leaf.¹ Byron laughed at the builders of a new Babel, who were so much less honest than the builders of the old that they would not disperse even when no man could understand his neighbor.² Again and again in his poetry we meet with such laments as that all science is but the replacing of one sort of ignorance by another,³ that the tree of knowledge has not fulfilled its promise,⁴ that happiness can be the lot only of those like the sleeping babe in *Cain*, who have not plucked the fruit and know not they are naked. Such ideas of the so-called "Satanic" school are echoed by others with a very different purpose. Wordsworth would abjure imaginations high on questions deep,⁵ bids us trust the simplicity of the child on whom those truths do rest which we are toiling all our lives to find,⁶ and reminds us that wisdom is oftentimes nearer when we stoop than when we soar.⁷ The advance of chemistry seems to have filled some minds a hundred years ago with just the same dread of *abiogenesis* which investigators such as Tyndall and Sir William Schäfer were destined to arouse among ourselves. Shel-

¹ The Statesman's Manual.

² The Deformed Transformed. Vol. II.

³ Manfred. Vol. II, p. iv.

⁴ Cain. Vol. I, p. i.

⁵ Excursion. Vol. III.

⁶ Intimations of Immortality.

⁷ Prelude. Vol. II.

ley's furtive research with test tubes was spoken of as a presage of his atheistic future, and his wife's *Frankenstein* was composed with the avowed object of horrifying. The myth about the gift of fire to mankind and the consequences for both weal and woe that had resulted from it, began again to haunt the imagination. Rousseau's first *Discours* on the uselessness of the arts had no more suggestive page than that presenting an emblematic vignette — the torch of science being handed to men by Prometheus, who warns a satyr that it burns.

In France also philosophic enthusiasm in the old sense was waning. The return of the Bourbons had indeed been followed by a relaxation of that iron censorship upon literature which Napoleon, who did nothing by halves, had used to entrench his own authority. Voltaire, Diderot, D'Alembert might be read again. But those who continued the traditions of the *Encyclopédie* were men like Cabanis, reducing thought to a secretion of the brain and poetry to a function of the smaller intestines, or missionaries from outside like Gall and Spurzheim, preaching the significance of bumps on the skull as a clue to capacities of character. One here and there, like Maine de Biran or Jouffroy, attempted a more adequate account of consciousness than had satisfied a D'Alembert and a Condillac, and for a time it seemed possible that psychology was about to lead its investigators beyond itself. But on the whole, French thought avoided the ultimate issues, limiting itself to such work as the empirical tabulation of correspondences between mental and neutral phenomena.

In Germany alone, as has been so often pointed out, the fine frenzy of metaphysic survived. There the ampler philosophic minds retained a faith in the competence of intellect for ultimate problems, and there for at least a few pioneers Romanticism and Intellectualism were not found incompatible. In 1807 Hegel published his *Phaenomenologie des Geistes*, in 1816 his *Logik*, and in 1817 his

Encyclopädie der philosophischen Wissenschaften. Probably never before or since has the complete adequacy of reason for any task that might fall to it been asserted at once so explicitly, so daringly, and on the whole so productively. "Metaphysic," said Novalis, "bakes no bread, but it can give us God, Freedom, and Immortality." It was the supposed allegiance of Fichte and Goethe to the same conviction which misled Carlyle into acclaiming them as the restorers to mankind of a faith which the Encyclopædists had almost destroyed. Whether Hegel rendered a real service of this kind to the church is still matter of dispute between the Hegelian "Right" and the Hegelian "Left." And as early as 1811 in Germany itself the school of Jacobi was in revolt against transcendental idealism, declaring the intellect forever incompetent when acting alone for those problems which it most concerns us to solve.

A second main idea to which the men of the Romantic impulse gave expression was a deepened feeling for history. The hard rationalists of the classical tradition had been far too contemptuous of the past to be at any pains in understanding it. It had been a time when Pope's *Homer* was much admired, with its chariot of Priam conceived like the equipage of an English noble, and when formal French tragedy had its Iphigeneias and its Andromaches decked out in the mode of the Rue de la Paix. Glib talk had gone round about a social contract in which primitive men had decided after public debate that Civilization should now incorporate itself, and the articles of indenture which bound the individual to the State had been so drawn that no attorney could find a flaw. Such anachronisms could have had no vogue at all except at a time of profound historical ignorance and no historical sympathy. The life and ideals of one period were freely projected into another, and bygone ages were reconstructed with the utmost arbitrariness to buttress some

favorite dogma or programme. As Lord Morley says in speaking of Rousseau, history was less a teacher than the meagrely nourished handmaid of the imagination.

The revulsion from a period in which men spoke of believing only what they could see produced a new sympathy with that long-derided time when it was the pride of faith to leave evidence far behind. Imaginative writing which brought back again donjons and cloisters, crusades and troubadours, was welcomed with an almost childish delight. The rage in England for Scott's mediæval romances and Byron's pictures of life under a Venetian Doge was typical of the time, though it was no less typical of the prosaic English mind that such a mood passed rapidly away. In France an Alfred de Vigny revived once more the faded glories of the old feudal aristocrat, and a Hugo denounced the profane modernizers of the fabric of Nôtre Dame. Carlyle complained that even German literature had come to be thought of as dealing only with wizards and ruined towers, with mailed knights, secret tribunals, monks, spectres, and banditti.⁸ Yet even this extravagance was symptomatic of a nascent feeling for history. For it implied a broader conception of the possible sources from which the past could be recovered, and a truer standpoint from which its movements could be appreciated.

This discord between the tone of the two centuries, appearing almost at the moment of transition from the one to the other, is among the great significant things in the history of thought. We must not, indeed, fall into the error of giving the whole credit to Romanticism, least of all if we take the type of all Romanticists to have been Rousseau. It would be a strange estimate of historical progress which should find in the author of *Contrat Social* an improver of the historical blemishes in Robertson or Gibbon. But the sympathetic feeling for mankind as such

⁸ State of German Literature (1827).

by which that famous book was inspired was destined sooner or later to make the past an object of more searching scrutiny, and to outlive its own first blundering embodiments. The word "romantic" is perhaps ill chosen to describe the new spirit that spread over Europe just one hundred years ago, but it has the sanction of long usage, and for want of a better it may still serve. Alike in art, in literature, in philosophy, in religion, a single impulse had revealed itself. It was the impulse to look backward rather than forward, reverence for the primitive, distrust of "march of intellect," a dim yet insistent faith that there had been no age of darkness towards which a philosophic age of light could rightly be contemptuous, a suspicion that science was about to overleap its limits to the eternal undoing of the human spirit, a passionate return to the natural instincts against the artificial contrivances of an arrogant Reason.

II

How did these tendencies act upon theology? When one's despair of human knowledge is intensified, his appreciation of history deepened, and his new respect for feeling supersedes his old respect for reasoning, will he become more amenable or less amenable to the direction of the church? The result is sure to vary in part at least with individual temperament.

We know how Shelley used to speak about the disappointment of the friends of intellectual progress. But Shelley was not typical. There was a widespread belief that authority is mankind's sole refuge, and it was inevitable that in France return to authority should mean return to Rome. Some of the leaders of this movement were priests, and — at least until the July Revolution of 1830 — the sacerdotal hand is conspicuous in French politics. Monasteries were restored, sacrilege was punished with a rigor almost unknown since the Middle

Ages, even the applicant for poor-law relief was required to produce his certificate of attendance at confession. The divine right of the monarchy was reasserted by Polignac, the last minister who served the ill-fated Charles X, and whose constantly recurring visions confirmed his faith that he was himself appointed by God to restore the kingship and the Church. It is an obvious suggestion that all this was the work of Jesuits, and we know well that the Jesuits as usual were busy. But the two most important figures for our present purpose were both laymen, one a cultivated diplomat of the old *noblesse*, who for fourteen years represented the Sardinian kingdom at the Russian capital, the other a man of letters, formerly an emigrant of the Revolution, but afterwards high in favor at the restored court of Louis XVIII, and for many years French Minister of Public Instruction. Both were reactionary in politics, eager to reëstablish autocratic rule in things spiritual no less than in things temporal, and ready to take advantage of that failure of public nerve which gave its chance to the propaganda of absolutism.

De Maistre is very generally known to all students of the period, and it is needless to recall his famous argument in *Du Pape* or in the *Soirées de Saint Petersburg*. We have the usual picture of that moral anarchy which calls for a supreme spiritual head, even as political anarchy can be dealt with only by a supreme head of the state. We have the usual arraignment of that whole theory of life which, according to the Roman view, had begun at the Renaissance, developed in Lutheranism, found its expositors in the *Encyclopédie*, and reached its practical culmination in the September massacres.⁹ But, although

⁹ How persuasive this line of thought appeared, even to some thinkers who never joined the Roman Church, may be seen from A. W. Schlegel's letter to M. de Montmorency: "The Protestant system does not satisfy me any longer. . . . I am convinced that the time is not far off when all Christians will reunite in the old faith. The work of the Reformation is accomplished, the pride of human reason which was evident

much less familiar than these books by De Maistre, the *Recherches Philosophiques* by the Vicomte de Bonald can cast more significant light on the movement of thought that was in progress. The author concentrates attention on two facts, of which each taken by itself is quite intelligible but whose combination is a curious enigma. The first is the prolonged failure of philosophy to reach any secure solution of its cosmic problems, a failure which in the hopeless discord of philosophers from Thales to Kant seemed long since as well attested as historical evidence could make it. The second is the unquenchable ardor with which, despite the disappointments of two thousand years and the demonstrated impotence of our intellectual machinery for the task, mankind refuses to draw the inference that seems so obvious, and the fruitless effort continues to be tried again. The rolling of the stone of Sisyphus was no mere poet's dream; it was rather a quite inadequate parable of the metaphysician's sublime folly.

How is this persisting impulse to be explained? De Bonald suggests that the human mind had imprinted upon it at the beginning certain truths of capital importance for moral and social development. Providence, duty, future rewards and punishments, were ideas not reached by reasoning, but implanted — as Descartes said about the notion of an Infinite Being — by God Himself upon our race at the first. The mythopoetic imagination corrupted them, and the grotesque legends by which they became overlaid called for that repudiation with which philosophy has been so copious. But philosophy destroyed good and evil alike. It discredited not only the myths but the principle round which the myths had grown up. It presumed, for example, to demand proof

in the first Reformers, and still more in their successors, has guided us so ill, especially during the last century, that it has come into antagonism with itself and has destroyed itself. It is perhaps ordained that those who have influence on the opinions of their contemporaries shall publicly renounce it, and then assist in preparing a union with the one Church of former days."

for that purposive structure of the universe which must be assumed as often as we prove anything, and which consequently cannot itself be proved at all. Small wonder then that *petitio principii* should abound in theistic argument. "We take within ourselves the resting-place on which we want to climb up; in a word, we gauge our own thought by itself, which puts us in the position of a man who wished to weigh himself without scales or weights. Playthings of our own illusions, we interrogate ourselves, and we take the echo of our own voice for the response of truth." Thus for De Bonald the spiritual anarchies of private judgment are like the social anarchies of individualism. In speculations purely theoretical, like some parts of astronomy for instance, each inquirer has to depend on his own gift of reasoning. But in ascertaining the truths by which we have to *live*, no such desperate task is laid upon us. We are not forced to make an independent chemical analysis before we eat our food, and neither have we to conduct for ourselves a logical investigation into the ultimate things we are to believe. The Most High has implanted convictions in mankind for the life of the spirit, just as He has made the earth yield her fruit for the life of the body. In each case tradition, common consent, verification by long trial, are our sufficient guides.

De Bonald is a most persuasive writer, and, if he were better known, much of his argument would have a cordial reception from the anti-intellectualists of our own time. Mr. A. J. Balfour's defense of authority, for example, is at many points almost indistinguishable from it. Ten years after the publication of *Recherches Philosophiques*, and probably in complete ignorance not only of its tenor but even of its existence, the youthful Newman hit upon just the same line of thought. A speculative system of Traditionism became elaborated. And it was but natural that where reason fell into such disrepute credulity should

advance by leaps and bounds. The view that the Most High looks with disfavor upon mental shrewdness, that He has actually taken means by frustrating the struggles of intellect to drive us back upon a higher oracle, had the result of re-establishing the mediæval notion of belief as a virtue, and of the mind's virtuousness as proportioned to its receptivity. It is not strange, of course, that in Catholic countries a hundred years ago the illiterate and the unscientific should have been willing to accept every sort of marvel. But it does seem a little odd that in Paris itself, as late as the middle of the last century, educated people should have had no critical sense at all when a saint's wonder-working was reported. Mark Pattison found on a visit there in 1843 that in religious circles every miracle was believed just because it was miraculous, that the idea of truth seemed to have vanished, that whatever tended to the Church's glory was taken as self-evident, and all else dismissed as "a fiction of the Voltairians."¹⁰ Minds of the highest training and of the finest endowment among the Catholic laity had abjured the whole lesson of the French and German Enlightenment, and had reopened to all kinds of ecclesiastical myth with a readiness like that of the Channel Islanders in Hugo's *Travailleurs de la Mer*. The reaction in England was no less striking. It was actually the same man who wrote *The Idea of a University* and who defended the tale of the liquefaction of St. Januarius's blood; the same who produced *A Grammar of Assent* and who gave thanks for the *grazia* that had been vouchsafed in the healing of disease through the relics of St. Philip Neri; the same who shivered Charles Kingsley to fragments in one of the keenest of dialectical encounters and who exulted in the thought of the Virgin's joy in Paradise when she knew that her immaculate conception had been decreed by Pius IX. In these matters Newman was no extremist, rather a moderate Catholic, the culti-

¹⁰ Cf. Pattison's *Memoirs*, pp. 211, 212.

vator of a "wise and gentle minimism." Compared with men like Louis Veuillot he seems almost a freethinker. And he had certainly none of the diabetic thirst for the supernatural which marked such a zealot as W. G. Ward.

Herein a problem confronts those who would explain so curious a union of mental strength and mental subservience. Its strangeness is immensely reduced when we remember that the presupposition which for most of us renders at least a modern miracle wholly incredible had been swept out of sight for the men with whom we are here dealing, and that they were thoroughly logical in pursuing their new view to its last consequence. That the sun should have stood still on Gibeon and the moon in the valley of Ajalon had scarcely for them any greater antecedent improbability than that an earthly monarch should suspend a law by order in council. If such things were done for Joshua, why should not similar interference be witnessed still? If Ward and his friends had been as muddle-headed as the average, they would no doubt have taken refuge in the very popular expedient of first acknowledging a principle and then ignoring it. What Matthew Arnold called the withering of miracle at the breath of the *Zeitgeist* had no existence for them. They had faced the *Zeitgeist*, had definitely repudiated it, and were resolved that it should not further influence them unawares. To a Frederick Schlegel or a Tieck what we call marvels were common occurrences. They had brought back again into the atmosphere they breathed that vision of Moore:

"When earth was nearer to the skies
Than in these days of crime and woe,
And mortals saw without surprise
In the mid air angelic eyes
Bending upon this world below."¹¹

Again, a deepened historical imagination, combined with relaxed severity of historical criticism, obviously

¹¹ Loves of the Angels.

avored a new view of the old Church. This revealed itself in one respect which strikes the observer now as supremely absurd. The Reformation began to be resented on purely *artistic* grounds, for it had broken the spell under which the finest æsthetic masterpieces had been achieved. It had been lacking in that "sweetness" which Matthew Arnold demanded as the accompaniment of "light." Franz Horn roundly declared that no one can be a poet unless he is a Christian, nor does he condescend even to explain away the somewhat plausible poetic claims of a Sophocles or a Lucretius.¹² The natural inference was drawn by those artists who were by nature far from religious but who thought of Catholicism as Christianity raised to its highest power. Heine tells us with a savage sneer that swarms of German painters were turning papists because they felt that the greatness of a Fra Angelico depended on his belief in the sacred objects he depicted, and they hoped that if they too could school their souls to a Roman devoutness they might recover the lost secret of mediæval art.¹³ Such a variation of the "will to believe" was probably never contemplated by William James, but the craftsmen of the brush have seldom been careful about their logic. The *Aufklärung* was condemned as philistinism, and recoil from the *Aufklärung*, with whatever intellectual change this might involve, became the artistic creed.

One is struck too with the discontent with traditional histories of the Protestant Reformation that began to spread so rapidly in England. It appeared in many a surprising quarter, it was expressed by men who had not the least dogmatic sympathy with the Church of Rome,

¹² Cf. Carlyle's comment in *State of German Literature*: "The meaning here is very good; but why this phraseology? Is it not inviting the simple-minded (not to speak of scoffers, whom Horn very justly sniffs at) to ask when Homer subscribed the Thirty-Nine Articles; or whether Sadi and Hafig were really of the Bishop of Peterborough's opinion?"

¹³ Essay on "The Romantic School" in the *Review Europe Littéraire* (1833).

it began even to be turned to purposes of political intrigue by those who cared nothing for it in itself but whose choice of it as a weapon attests its congeniality with the mood of the hour. William Cobbett cannot be suspected of having been — in Charlotte Brontë's bitter phrase — a "tool of the Propaganda,"¹⁴ for Propaganda would have found reason for sore offense in many a passage of the *Political Register*. Nor can Benjamin Disraeli have been such, as *Lothair* is enough to remind us, for he was much more given to fashioning a tool for himself out of whatever popular sentiment his lynx eye detected, and he must have seen a real chance in the anti-Reformation spirit which he voiced in the years of his political apprenticeship. And if anyone suspects a leaning to Romanism in Thomas Carlyle, it will be enough to refer to his *Cromwell* or to his *Historical Sketches* in almost any chapter which one opens by chance. Yet these three so widely different men began to celebrate once more the blessings of monastic rule, to set it in favorable contrast with the age of brass in which they were themselves so unfortunate as to live, and thus indirectly to win a new respect for the sort of faith under which monasticism had been possible. *Sybil* suggests to us a most unorthodox view of the glorious Revolution of 1688. The Lord of Marney Abbey is there spoken of as having joined with other Whig nobles to call over the Prince of Orange, because of a general alarm among the aristocrats that their landed interest was in peril. There was "a prevalent impression that King James intended to insist on the restitution of the Church estates to their original purpose, to wit, the education of the people and the maintenance of the poor."¹⁵ Cobbett, filled with the idea that in the good old days tithe had been applied to the relief of distress, that under feudalism the lords spiritual and lords temporal had cared for those whom *laissez faire* would permit to starve, and that in

¹⁴ Shirley. Vol. I.

¹⁵ Sybil. Vol. I, p. iii.

particular the abbots and priors had acted as a kind of earthly providence to their children, produced a *History of the Reformation* at which men like Thomas Arnold stood aghast.¹⁶ Its burden, to use the lurid language of the author, was that the change in the sixteenth century had been "engendered in beastly lust, brought forth in hypocrisy, cherished and fed by plunder and devastation and by rivers of English and Irish blood." Even Carlyle, in fierce disgust with the radical poor-law, the gospel of unrestricted competition, and the creed of "No Government," set up in contrast the benevolent régime of an old Catholic monastery, with a real governor of men at its head: "This is Abbot Samson's Catholicism of the twelfth century; somewhat like the *ism* of all true men in all centuries, I fancy! Alas, compared with any of the *isms* current in these poor days, what a thing."¹⁷

None of these authors, except the last, can be definitely classified as a Romanticist, but they had caught the spirit which the Romantic movement had diffused. The Industrial Revolution was typical of an age of contract and individualism, just as feudal manners belonged to the age of status and the clan. The new-born middle class marked that breach with the past which no good Romanticist could bear, and it found its natural defenders in men like Mill who inherited the tradition of the *Encyclopédie*, just as it found its natural assailants in men like Carlyle to whom the *Encyclopédie* was anathema. What Disraeli called the "spirit of rapacious covetousness"¹⁸ and "the Altar of Mammon blazing with triple worship"¹⁹ stimulated comparison with a remote golden age of priestly benevolence that was, no doubt, largely mythical. Charles Kingsley, though he had no patience with compliments to pre-Reformation days, did not scruple to join in the onslaught upon the "Fathers of the Scrip Church"²⁰ who

¹⁶ Cf. Stanley's *Life of Arnold*, p. 59.

¹⁷ *Past and Present*. ¹⁸ *Loc. cit.*

¹⁸ Sybil. Vol. I, p. iii.

²⁰ The phrase is from Dickens.

were leading modern industrialism, and declared his own to be perhaps the most sensual generation since Alaric sacked Rome.²¹ Mill felt impelled to insert in his *Principles of Political Economy* a reference to the "would-be revivers of old times which they do not understand," pointing out that the fabric of patriarchal and seignorial influence which it was proposed to restore would be shattered against the necessity of enforcing a stringent Poor Law.²² Even Macaulay was so moved by Manzoni's picture of the ancient church as to record in his diary that he had read it with tears, and that if he could believe it to be a true representation of what the Roman communion had been, he should be tempted to follow Newman's example.²³ We realize perhaps best of all how keen was the new antagonism, and how strangely it affected historical judgments, when we find so fanatical a Protestant as the editor of *Cromwell's Letters* turning aside to glorify the government of a mediæval monk.

III

But there was another and a very different side to Romanticism, a side so prominent that the historians of literature dwell upon it almost to the exclusion of the tendencies we have mentioned. It was the glorifying of impulse as against reason, of the individual as against controlling authority, of self-fulfilment and self-expression as against self-denial and self-restraint. Not all the Romanticists had this spirit in equal degree, and Goethe, who in some of his work may be looked upon as its prophet, had that other mood at times in which he counseled *Entsagung*, and led some admirers to mistake him for a preacher of the Cross. Nor did the Romanticists originate, they rather developed and insisted upon that apotheosis of the feelings which we can trace back to the moral-sense school of the

²¹ Cf. *Life and Letters of Charles Kingsley*. Vol. I, p. 38.

²² *Pol. Econ.* Vol. IV, p. vii.

²³ Cf. *Trevelyan's Life*.

eighteenth century. A few of them, like Coleridge, were even keenly alive to its dangers, regarding the sentimentalism of Sterne as more likely to corrupt the conscience than the materialism of Hobbes.²⁴

Strange as it may sound to us now, Germany was once the special home of this law-defying individualism, with all its merits and all its faults. Professor Georg Brandes in a very memorable passage written almost twenty years ago, and whose poignant truthfulness we have had sad reason to appreciate, called attention to the contrast between the Berlin of 1900 and the Berlin of a century earlier. He observed that the capital in our own time was crowded with men in uniform, the literature in its book-shops was intensely practical, the very furniture and ornaments on display spoke of the flowing tide of militarism. Clocks were decorated, not as of old with knights kneeling to kiss a lady's finger-tips, but with uhlans and cuirassiers clicking their heels together on parade. The pendant of a watch-chain was a conical bullet, and candelabra were formed of piled muskets. "The metal in fashion is iron," said Professor Brandes; "The word in fashion is also iron."²⁵ Yet this regimented nation once gloried in the boast of *Freigeisterei*. The circle of Goethe and Schiller at Weimar believed in nothing so much as in the defiance of restraint and the exalting of "nature" above "convention." Jean Paul, Wieland, and a host of others preached the same gospel with their pens, and did not scruple to set the new example in their practice. Carlyle's strange delusion that the German people was to become Europe's regenerator in virtue may be met by a far more

²⁴ Cf. *Aids to Reflection*. Vol. I, p. 26. "All the evil achieved by Hobbes and the whole school of materialists will appear inconsiderable if it be compared with the mischief effected and occasioned by the sentimental philosophy of Sterne and his numerous imitators. The vilest appetites and the most remorseless inconstancy towards their objects acquired the titles of *the heart*, *the irresistible feelings*, *the too tender sensibility*; and if the frosts of prudence, the icy chains of human law, thawed and vanished at the genial warmth of human nature, who could help it? It was an amiable weakness!"

²⁵ *Main Currents of Nineteenth Century Literature*. Vol. II, p. 17.

plausible argument that that race was to illustrate in turn the diverse excesses of immoralism — first the variety which springs from a frantic assertion of the personal ego, then the variety which comes from a cringing submission to the dominant *Reich*. If Treitschke was to be the apostle of the latter, Max Stirner was the apostle of the former.

Yet enthusiasm for what was called “return to nature” is perhaps the most characteristic common element in the Romanticists, and “nature” was curiously identified with the emotional rather than the ratiocinative impulse in mankind. It was an odd reaction against a still odder myth, the myth endorsed by Warburton when he said that “the image of God in which man was at first created lay in the faculty of reason only.” The prevalent view that Rousseau was responsible for all the absurdities of this contrast between the “natural” and the “developed” does far less than justice — as can be easily shown — to the teaching either of *Emile* or of the *Contrat Social*. Yet Rousseau’s recurring doctrine, that the kindly tendencies of nature are thwarted and perverted by artificial restraint, lent itself to that ideal of wayward autonomy which his successors and imitators were so keen to recommend. Not only positive codes, but every sort of agreed convention became an object of contempt. The vagaries of what is now called “free love” acquired a sort of sentimental sanctity. The English reader of Swinburne and of Oscar Wilde will recognize at once how this side of the Romantic movement developed.

Perhaps Wordsworth affords the clearest illustration from our own literature of that winsome Nature-cult in which the first Romanticists delighted, a cult which has always such seductive appeal for the young, and which is so apt to persist in those whose advance in years has been accompanied by no corresponding advance in thought. Nature was for Wordsworth in early life the one instruct-

ress in virtue; the world of sense, whose glories were welcomed with a childlike responsiveness, had no need of being interpreted by reason, and those who tried to prescribe for the developing mind its course in books were like sham physicians who pretend to teach the body how to grow. The "speaking face of earth and heaven" was man's all-sufficient guide. The poet himself had been allowed in childhood to cull such flowers of learning as might tempt a random choice. He was contented if he might enjoy the things which others understand. And his programme for Lucy in *Lyrical Ballads* was formed on a like principle. The floating clouds and the bending willow and the motions of the storm should be her training school; she should learn composure from the silence and the calm of mute insensate things; the stars of midnight should become dear to her, and among winding rivulets the beauty born of murmuring sound should pass into her face. Twenty years afterwards Wordsworth explained the wickedness of Peter Bell by the fact that "Nature" could never find her way into that young reprobate's heart, that the changes of the seasons somehow conveyed to him no moral truth, and that to his seared soul a primrose by the river's brim was nothing more than a yellow primrose! He was led to wonder whether the waywardness of mankind did not spring less from the fact that we are poor observers than from the misfortune that the things we have a chance to observe are often insufficient for our education. Was Peter so evil because he was divorced in spirit from what he saw, or because he saw Nature's less inspiring moods, for "Peter Bell and she had often been together"? Perhaps his savageness even arose from the savage character of mountains and of dreary moors? And the poet confesses that he has himself come to look on Nature, not as in the hour of thoughtless youth, but hearing oftentimes the still sad music of humanity. He throws out a hint that many of us need a direction

from stern conscience as well as the genial influence of earth and heaven. This is just the imposed morality that Romanticists had so derided, but for most of them return to Nature did not thus eventuate in return beyond Nature. Shelley's mocking voice in *Peter Bell the Third* warned us not to exchange the buoyant inspiration of wood and stream for the things that "old parsons say in burying-grounds."

IV

To ground the church's authority upon the failures of unassisted intelligence is a form of apologetic that has been much abused. Theologians have again and again bethought themselves that the impotence of reason might thus be exploited. That ignorance can be made the mother of devotion is a tenet widely imputed to the Church of Rome. Most of us, however, have heard many a Protestant sermon in which the disappointments of philosophic inquiry were not less exultantly emphasized, and the inference of an infallible Book was drawn with just the same logic that led Manning to an infallible pontiff. An Anglican divine of great note some sixty years ago had even the daring to deride the moral consciousness itself, to parade the antinomies as a schoolmaster to bring us back to faith, and to find in the hopelessness of agnosticism a basis for Christian humility. Edward Caird used to warn us against this sort of argument. He called it seeking a place for religion in the *lacunae* of science. In our own day we have met with those whose reply to the evolutionists has consisted only in dwelling upon the notorious "gaps," and we have seen such ground often crumble beneath their feet. The satisfaction with which men once noted the fact of a "missing link" and the alarm with which the possibility of its appearance was anticipated, find a parallel just now in the anxiety with which the rumor of a chemical production

of life is still whispered among the fearful. To rejoice in the break-down of the human mind as it labors unhelped, and to expect from its humiliation a mood of deeper submissiveness to external control, is to forget that reason and faith are alike sons of God, and that disrespect to either is disrespect to both.²⁶ Theological champions who thus plan their campaign might well lay to heart the aphorism of Coleridge, that the same truth is at once shield and bow, and that as a disputant plucks the weapon from his wound he has often to recognize an arrow from his own quiver.²⁷

Yet there was a value in that same Romantic distrust of intellect, just as there is a value in Professor Bergson's similar scepticism about reasoning at the present day. Adverse and often exasperated critics see nothing in either but a new credulity. But to a great extent it is the critics rather than the criticized who are credulous. Men may, indeed, still think that the sole road to truth was that of the *Encyclopédie*, and that — as Carlyle put it — there is in reality "no truth except that which can be argued of."²⁸ They may think that there are no ultimate convictions necessary to man's life and thought, attested by that very necessity as trustworthy, unless we are to suppose the universe a chaos and our own quenchless belief in its order an inexplicable delusion, yet incapable of proof just because all proof begins there and so cannot lead thither. Or they may think that these indispensable convictions can still be securely held and confidently acted upon without any preference for that cosmic scheme which is alone reconcilable with them over other cosmic schemes which undoubtedly contradict them. That there are minds of this cast is a fact of which philosophy must take notice, somewhat sadly. But they are credulous minds, and they are a little too apt to measure the develop-

²⁶ Cf. A. M. Fairbairn, *The Philosophy of the Christian Religion*.

²⁷ Cf. *Aids to Reflection*. Vol. I, p. 132.

²⁸ *Essay on Diderot*.

ment of others by their own capacity for incoherence. They have still need to learn that new and deeper psychology of belief so admirably summarized by Dean Church, and for which many had to thank the men of the Tractarian Movement: "that not arguments only, but the whole condition of the mind to which they are addressed — and not the reasonings only which could be stated, but those which went on darkly in the mind, and which 'there was not at the moment strength enough to bring forth,' real and weighty reasons which acted like the obscure rays of the spectrum, with their proper force yet eluding distinct observation — had their necessary and legitimate place in determining belief."²⁹ For this idea the Oxford men owed, through Coleridge, more than they themselves knew to the Romanticists.

Again, we have long been accustomed to hear from Protestant quarters that the greatest enemy of the Church of Rome is the impartial historian. One cannot help feeling, for example, that if Lord Acton had known less history than he did, so devoutly religious a mind would have been less recalcitrant when the pontiff so long held in reverence imposed as *de fide* an acceptance of the Vatican Decrees. But the judgment of historians upon the claim of the Holy See has been found as variable as Bacon found the judgment of science upon Christian faith. To adapt the famous aphorism, we may admit that a little history inclines one to Rome, while we insist that more history drives one far from her.

The present writer, at least, has long looked with a measure of sympathetic appreciation upon those for whom, one hundred years ago, the glamor of the Papacy was restored. De Maistre was a witness as opportune as Dante five centuries before, to the spiritual independence of the Church. The Concordat by which Pius VII purchased imperial favor at the price of conceding the Gal-

²⁹ Church, *The Oxford Movement*, p. 256.

lican liberties may be excused as a yielding to *force majeure*, but on the face of it looks as simoniacal a transaction as ever disgraced the administration of Boniface VIII. It may be incredible that the Most High has appointed a human viceregent to bear spiritual rule from a single centre to the ends of the earth. But it is at least not more absurd, and it is vastly less incoherent, than to think of "national" Churches, each one of which has been endowed with the awful power to bind and to loose, but each one of which must at the same time exercise its solemn function in strict subservience to the temporal authority of the State.³⁰ Against such a travesty of sacred things every word that was spoken by Lammenais, by Montalembert, by Lacordaire, was a word for truth and earnestness. We see the same healthy resentment in Schleiermacher's protest against a State-imposed Prussian liturgy. If there is an apostolic succession — as Lambeth no less than Rome maintains — then the apostles who transmit it are surely no mere subordinates of the discordant civil powers, or mouthpieces of the dominant national feeling. Something quite different from either loyalty or patriotism must be the first of their concerns. How sorely a counteractive was needed for the Erastianism of the hour may be seen from some ecclesiastical arrangements recorded in the contemporary literature. The practice of the fallen French Empire had become a model in many things, and beyond doubt Napoleon had his national clergy well in hand. We hear, for example, of one preacher who was supposed to be delivering lectures on theism, and who was specially expert in devising the *double entendre* by which compliments to the emperor might be insinuated in the language of devout-

³⁰ Cf. Thackeray's extraordinary outburst in the Irish Sketch Book against the Pope's appointment of an English bishop to the see of "Aurcliolopolis," and his query about what His Holiness would think if the Archbishop of Canterbury nominated a bishop of the Palatine or the Suburra! It illustrates the mood in which Churches were regarded as pieces of national organization.

ness. Even he, however, failed to come up to the standard, for Fouché, acting on Napoleon's behalf, pointed out that a really patriotic address on the existence of God should contain some words in support of military conscription. The catechism was recast by imperial order, questions were inserted on the duty of Frenchmen to the chief of their State, and it was intimated in the answers that he who failed not only to obey but to "love" Napoleon would be eternally damned! When in defiance of the Holy See all manner of State-nominated bishops were thrust into dioceses, the clergy were forbidden to express the smallest disapproval, and on one occasion two hundred and thirty-six seminarists who had refused to assist at the mass of an imperial bishop were at once unfrocked and drafted into a regiment. Priests, like all others, were to be "hundred-per-cent Frenchmen, Frenchmen first, last, and all the time." Such records help one to understand the strange declaration of that other "constitutional priest," Cimourdain in Hugo's *Quatre-vingt-treize*, "je suis prêtre, mais je crois en Dieu."³¹ It was surely time for ultramontanism, or any other *ism*, to reassert that the Church of God is not a branch of the national civil service varying with each change from the Assembly to the Consulate, from the Consulate to the Empire, and from the Empire back to the house of Bourbon.³²

As we attempt to estimate the loss and gain which have resulted from all these tendencies, we must feel that neither has been the monopoly of one school, but that the imprint of the Romanticists, for both good and evil, is

³¹ *Quatre-vingt-treize*. Vol. II, p. 8.

³² The almost forgotten novels of John Galt have some sly hits at the same sort of State-sustaining religion in England. Cf. the complaint of the Rev. Micah Balwhidder that smuggling continued to flourish, though he had preached sixteen times from the text "Render unto Caesar the things that are Caesar's (*Annals of the Parish*, p. 10); and Mr. Cayenne's request that his doctor should summon a clergyman to his death-bed, because, "you know, that in these times, doctor, it is the duty of every good subject to die a Christian" (*ibid.*, p. 151).

still on each branch of Christendom. Neither the Roman nor the Protestant communion has quite failed in our day to advance beyond the hardness of the old intellectualist apologetic, to realize that the basis of religion is no mere assent — however vigorously coerced — to the formulæ of a creed, and that the value-judgments of the heart rather than the cogency of a syllogism are the source of saving faith. As they think of the universe testifying to its Creator, neither can now much appreciate Addison's lines about the spacious firmament and the blue ethereal sky proclaiming their great Original, and rejoicing in Reason's ear. For they have alike come to acknowledge that external Nature taken alone seems to proclaim many different things, and that Reason without moral feeling is a poor guide. They are alike attracted rather by Wordsworth's simile of the child who holds to his ear the convolutions of a smooth-lipped shell, who hears those sonorous cadences which suggest mysterious union with its native sea, and who symbolizes that faith in a moral order which yields "authentic tidings of invisible things."

Enlightened men of all Christian creeds now alike look back with sympathetic reverence to the generations inspired by the same faith as themselves, though the dialects in which that faith expressed itself show a limitless variety, and they have alike become alive to the indecent outrage of examining with kindly appreciation the religious *nisus* in all the ethnic cults of the world while a cold and scornful glance is turned upon a thousand years of Christianity. They alike increasingly turn aside from perhaps the grossest of all ecclesiastical corruptions — the attitude of those to whom the Church meant no more than a department of the State, a more or less serviceable agency of moral restraint, a handmaid of government and a prop to those "powers that be" which, whatever their character, churchmen were once prepared to sanction as ordained of God. For this new spirit which the Romantic

impulse did so much to foster, the liberals and the conservatives in theology must be alike thankful. But, like all other reactions, the reaction from the eighteenth century has shown itself a fresh cause of discord among the very men who are most indebted to it, separating those who fear the excesses and those who are impatient with the limits of the new traditionism, marshaling in one camp those to whom the backward movement seems always in danger of going too far and in another those to whom it never seems to have courage for going far enough. The elements are now so intermingled that it has become difficult to say who is a Romanticist and who is not. For the heirs of that impulse in our own time are to be seen exalting Reason or denouncing it, despising history or appealing to it, finding in "the witness of the heart" an authentication of the things unseen and eternal or sufficient authority for each vagrant passion of the "natural" man. There is, in truth, no single movement of thought in these high fields whose fruit is not thus liable to manifold variation. As in the great parable, we must still be content to see tares and wheat growing together until the harvest. But neither must we forget the point at which that analogy stops. For the harvest of thought is one that ripens from year to year, and it is the office of successive critics, according to such light as may be in them, to wield the sickle fearlessly.

A NEGLECTED PRINCIPLE OF LITURGICAL
REVISION

ROBERT PIERCE CASEY

HARVARD UNIVERSITY

The Second Report of the Joint Commission on the Book of Common Prayer is an interesting document, not only for the history of liturgy in the American Church but also in showing, perhaps more by implication than by direct statement, the lines along which thought in the Episcopal Church is at present moving.

The resolution of 1913 which created this Commission provides that "no proposition involving the faith and doctrine of the Church shall be considered or reported upon" by it. Yet no far-reaching change in liturgy can be made without reference to theological considerations, and many of these come out clearly in the Report. The main points where doctrinal influences are apparent are in connection with (1) the revision of the wording of certain Collects, with a tendency to eliminate or soften some of the harsher elements of the old doctrine of God's providence; (2) the Holy Communion; (3) the visitation and healing of the sick. These are scarcely questions to be settled without serious discussion of their theological implications, and it is difficult to imagine any previous generation supposing that they could be regarded from an exclusively liturgical point of view.

I. *The doctrine of God.* In the prayer "For Fair Weather," among the Prayers and Thanksgivings upon Several Occasions, it is suggested to change the reading so as to omit the bracketed portions:

"Almighty and most merciful Father, we humbly beseech Thee of thy great goodness, to restrain those immoderate rains wherewith [for our sins] Thou hast afflicted us. And we pray Thee to send us

such seasonable weather, that the earth may in due time yield her increase for our use and benefit [And give us grace that we may learn by thy punishments to amend our lives, and for thy clemency to give thee thanks and praise;] through Jesus Christ our Lord."

Still more striking is the substitute offered for the prayer "In Time of great Sickness and Mortality."

Present Form

O Almighty God, the Lord of life and death, of sickness and health, regard our supplications, we humbly beseech thee; and, as thou has thought fit to visit us for our sins with great sickness and mortality, in the midst of thy judgment, O Lord, remember mercy. Have pity upon us, miserable sinners, and withdraw from us the grievous sickness with which we are afflicted. May this thy fatherly correction have its due influence upon us by leading us to consider how frail and uncertain our life is; that we may apply our hearts unto that heavenly wisdom which in the end will bring us to everlasting life; through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

Proposed Form

O most mighty and merciful God, we flee unto thee for succor by reason of the grievous sickness that has come upon us. Deliver us, we beseech thee, from our peril; give strength and skill to all who are engaged in the care of the sick, and prosper the means which shall be made use of for their cure; and grant that, perceiving how frail and uncertain our life is, we may apply our hearts unto that heavenly wisdom which in the end will bring us to everlasting life; through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

The conclusion of the prayer "For a Sick Person" reads at present, "And in thy good time restore him to health and enable him to lead the residue of his life in thy fear and to thy glory. Or else give him grace so to take thy visitation, that after this painful life ended, he may dwell with thee in life everlasting." It is revised to read, "in thy fear and to thy glory; and grant that finally he may dwell with thee in life everlasting."

Very similar in idea is the change made in the prayer
 "For a Sick Child."

The Old Form

Almighty God, and merciful Father, to whom alone belong the issues of life and death, look down from Heaven, we humbly beseech thee, with the eyes of thy mercy upon the sick child for whom our prayers are desired. Deliver him, O Lord, in thy good appointed time from his bodily pain and visit him with thy salvation; that if it be thy good pleasure to prolong his days here on earth, he may live to thee and be an instrument of thy glory, by serving thee faithfully and doing good in his generation. Or else receive him into those heavenly habitations where the souls of those who sleep in the Lord Jesus enjoy perpetual rest and felicity. Grant this, O Lord, for the love of thy Son, our Saviour, Jesus Christ. Amen.

The New Form

O Heavenly Father, almighty and merciful, who lovest all children, and hast filled the world with gladness, pour out thy blessing, we beseech thee, upon the sick child for whom our prayers are offered. Guide by thy wisdom the efforts made for his cure, and mightily increase our confidence in thy love; that he, resting in our faith and sustained by thy power, may be made well and may live to thee in the joy of thy service; through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

In the prayer "For a Person Under Affliction" the bracketed portions are to be omitted:

"O Merciful God and heavenly Father who hast taught us in thy holy Word that thou dost not willingly afflict or grieve the children of men, look with pity we beseech Thee upon the sorrows of thy servant, for whom our prayers are desired. [In thy wisdom thou hast seen fit to visit him with trouble and to bring distress upon him.] Remember him, O Lord, in mercy; [sanctify thy fatherly correction to him;] endue his soul with patience [under his affliction, and with resignation to thy blessed will]; comfort him with a sense of thy goodness; lift up thy countenance upon him and give him peace, through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen. "

The present prayer for Malefactors is to be dropped and a substitute is provided under the title "For Prisoners."

For Malefactors

O most gracious and merciful God, we earnestly beseech thee to have pity and compassion upon those persons recommended to our prayers, who now lie under the sentence of the law and are appointed to die. Visit them, O Lord, with thy mercy and salvation; convince them of the miserable condition they are in by their sins and wickedness; and let thy powerful grace produce in them such a godly sorrow and sincere repentance as thou wilt be pleased to accept. Give them a strong and lively faith in thy Son our blessed Saviour, and make it effectual to the salvation of their souls. O Lord, in judgment remember mercy; and whatever sufferings they are to endure in this world, yet deliver them, O God, from the bitter pains of eternal death. Pardon their sins and save their souls, for the sake and merits of thy dear Son, our blessed Saviour and Redeemer. Amen.

For Prisoners

O God who sparest when we deserve punishment, and in thy wrath rememberest mercy, we humbly beseech thee of thy goodness to comfort and succor all prisoners who are under reproach in the house of bondage (especially those who are condemned to die). Give them a right understanding of themselves and of thy promises; that trusting wholly in thy mercy, they may not place their confidence anywhere but in thee. Relieve the distressed, protect the innocent, awaken the guilty; and forasmuch as thou alone bringest light out of darkness and good out of evil, grant to these thy servants that by the power of thy Holy Spirit their souls may be set free from the chains of sin, and they may be brought to newness of life; through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

The "Thanksgiving for Deliverance from Great Sickness and Mortality" is to be dropped from the Prayer Book.

All these proposed emendations and omissions are directed against a theory of God and man which was fundamental to the authors of the Prayer Book. Our ancestors interpreted human life from an almost exclu-

sively moral point of view. Every man was a fallen creature, raised from complete corruption only by the grace of God working in him from the time of his baptism. His goal was heaven, his peril hell. The thing needful was to find the way of life which led to the one and avoided the other. For this purpose a moral economy existed in the universe which left no event without retributive or disciplinary effect on man. The apparent evils of life were notes of warning, its joys were messages of encouragement from the Power that worked in this world for the salvation of men's souls in the world to come. This theory was absolutely complete and compact, leaving no event unexplained or unrelated to the moral purpose of God.

The objection felt by moderns to this view was that a God who was responsible for many of the painful incidents of this life was neither lovable nor respectable, and that to save the Divine character it was necessary to sever from God's immediate control events which before had been regarded as his special instruments for realizing his purpose of bringing men to himself. The origin of this objection is to be found in the steady decline of the theory of man's corruption through Adam, and the fading of definiteness in the belief about the future. Late in the nineteenth century the biological doctrine of evolution was taken over into sociology and given a mystical turn by theologians who traced philosophical descent from Schelling and his school. The prevailing view of the conditions and destiny of humanity was completely changed; the joys of heaven and horrors of hell ceased to be factors in modern life; and this reacted on the ideas of God in that the feeling for the immediate practical necessity of adapting life to a fixed and known retributive system disappeared. It was felt that God in the rôle of a stern judge and wise disciplinarian of his fallen and worthless creatures could be held responsible for many things which, in

his new rôle of guide and support to humanity evolving from primitive savagery to ordered moral society, he could not assume without serious loss of respect.

It was the boast of modern liberal Protestantism that it set Christianity free from the fearsomeness and awe of the Calvinistic universe by reviving the primitive doctrine of the Fatherhood of God. The primitive character of the form in which this doctrine has been revived and popularized may be questioned, but its practical effect in sentimentalizing and weakening the ancient conception of God is unmistakable. God has been removed from the realms of the unpleasant, but the removal has been one of fiction and not of fact. Suffering and evil are still facts of life and form a problem for the theologians, the importance of which the war has not tended to minimize. The essence of theism is the attempt to interpret the behavior of the universe, taken as a whole, in its relation to human life. No theology can hope for permanent support which closes its eyes to all but one aspect of the world's behavior.

II. *The Holy Communion.* In the revision of the Order for the Holy Communion several important changes have been suggested. The title of the service is changed to "The Divine Liturgy, being the order for The Lord's Supper or Holy Eucharist, commonly called The Holy Communion." The Ten Commandments may be read in a shortened form. The Summary of the Law is changed to read, "with all thy heart and with all thy soul and with all thy mind and with all thy strength." The *Dominus vobiscum* is introduced before the Collects of the day. An anthem or hymn is admitted between the Epistle and Gospel. "Praise be to thee, O Christ," may be said after the Gospel. A rubric authorizing the celebrant to ask for "the secret intercessions of the congregation for any who have desired the prayers of the Church" is introduced before the prayer "For the Whole State of Christ's Church."

The word "Militant" no longer appears after "Christ's Church" in the invitation to that prayer, and the wording of the prayer is somewhat changed. The last of the "Comfortable Words" is amended to read, "If any man sin, we have an Advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the Righteous, and he is the Propitiation for our sins; and not for ours only, but also for the whole world." The *Dominus vobiscum* is inserted before the *Sursum Corda*. The *Benedictus qui venit* is authorized after the *Sanctus*. Proper prefaces are inserted for the Epiphany, for the Annunciation, Purification, and Transfiguration, and for All Saints' Day. The Prayer of Humble Access is transferred to a place immediately after the Prayer of Consecration; the Lord's Prayer is placed before the administration of the elements and is introduced by the sentence, "As our Saviour Jesus Christ hath commanded and taught us, let us say —." Provision is made for the *Agnus Dei*, or for some other hymn or hymns, to be sung during the Communion. The Lord's Prayer before the Thanksgiving is dropped, and the latter is introduced by: "Having now received the Precious Body and Blood of Christ, let us give thanks to the Lord our God." A rubric is admitted authorizing a Deacon to read the ante-Communion service. The ablutions rubric is amended so as to provide for reservation: "If any of the consecrated bread and wine remain after the Communion, it shall not be carried out of the church, but shall immediately after the blessing be reverently consumed. But *Note*, That subject to the regulation of the Ordinary, the Priest may reserve so much of the consecrated bread and wine as may be required for the Communion of the Sick." Another important rubric is the following: "When for any reason it is deemed inadvisable to use the common cup in the administration, the Bishop may authorize the Priest to use the method of Intinction." The general impression given by these changes is an increase of emphasis on the

doctrine of the Real Presence. The admission of the *Agnus Dei* and the *Benedictus qui venit* are certainly in this direction, and the provision for reservation, though put in the form of a provision for the Communion of the sick, is really the legalizing of the long-continued practice in the American Church of reserving the sacrament for adoration as well as for use in Communion.

The provision for intinction would seem at first a triumph for the Broad Churchmen, but this is doubtful. Nothing has been more distracting from the service than the expedients which many of the clergy have adopted to preserve their congregation from the danger of infection through the chalice. Purificators, sometimes dipped in alcohol or water, have been flourished before the communicants between each communication. Elaborate announcements explaining the method of intinction and its necessity have been introduced into the service. It is not inconceivable that congregations will prefer to adopt the Roman method of communication in one kind to these odious interruptions of devotion.

More important than any change made in the service of Holy Communion itself is the introduction into the body of Collects, Epistles, and Gospels of a special Collect, Epistle, and Gospel for the Solemnization of Matrimony and for the Burial of the Dead. No special provision for the use of these is made in either the office for the Burial of the Dead or the Marriage Service. They could find natural place only in Nuptial and Requiem Masses.

The intellectual issue raised by the admission of Requiem Masses is apparent. For the Roman Church this practice has been a natural expression and outgrowth of the teaching of the sacrifice of the Mass. The Episcopal Church, however, following the Church of England, has always set itself against this teaching. The objection received classic form in the thirty-first of the Articles of Religion:

"The Offering of Christ once made is that perfect redemption, propitiation, and satisfaction for all the sins of the whole world, both original and actual; and there is none other satisfaction for sin but that alone. Wherefore the sacrifices of Masses, in the which it was commonly said, that the Priest did offer Christ for the quick and the dead, to have remission of pain or guilt, were blasphemous fables and dangerous deceits."

If the practice of Requiem Masses is to be revived and authorized by the Church, some statement is surely called for, expressing either agreement or disagreement with Roman teaching on this subject and declaring the grounds on which a custom so long disused and disliked is revived.

This point has, of course, frequently been the subject of sharp controversy; but it is to be feared that the motive which has influenced both sides has been ritual rather than theological interest. It has become fashionable to have Requiem Masses, just as it has become fashionable to import many other Roman practices into the services of the Church, and those who favor these importations naturally desire support in the Prayer Book for what they do. The spirit of these men is very different from that of Newman and his followers, with whom theology was primary. Their object was to influence the mind of the Church to a fuller acceptance of what they believed to be Catholic teaching, and their weapons and defense were logic and argument. Their successors do not understand their theology, and endeavor to perpetuate their work by the revival of ceremonies rather than the discussion of principles.

III. *The Healing of the Sick.* In the office for the Visitation of the Sick, besides several changes of the same general nature as those proposed for the occasional prayers and thanksgivings, there is a cautiously worded rubric providing for auricular confession: "Then shall the sick person be moved to make a special confession of his sins, if he feels his conscience troubled in any matter; after

which confession, the Minister shall assure him of God's mercy and forgiveness."

More important is the Appendix inserted after the service of Visitation:

"Following the teaching and practice of Our Lord and his Apostles, the Church from the beginning hath exercised the Ministry of Healing, always with a prayer of Faith, often accompanied with anointing with oil or with the imposition of hands. When any sick person shall in humble faith desire this ministry through anointing or laying on of hands, the Minister may use such portion of the foregoing Office as he shall think fit, and the following form:

'O blessed Redeemer, relieve, we beseech thee, by thy indwelling power the distress of this thy servant; release him from sin and drive away all pain of soul and body, that being restored to soundness of health he may offer thee praise and thanksgiving; Who livest and reignest with the Father and the Holy Ghost, one God, world without end. Amen.

I anoint thee with oil (lay my hand upon thee), in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, beseeching the mercy of Our Lord Jesus Christ, that all thy pain and sickness of body being put to flight, the blessing of health may be restored to thee.'"

It must be admitted at once that the revival of this custom has behind it the support of apostolic authority. Healing by the imposition of hands was an important feature of the ministry of Jesus, a feature which he strove to make subordinate to his preaching without much success so far as the multitude was concerned. The practice was continued by the apostles and was one of the recognized signs which witnessed the Divine power which possessed them. Exorcism by the use of various formulæ, by the imposition of hands, and with anointing of oil, was a recognized function of the Catholic ministry throughout the Middle Ages. Yet the fact that the healing ministry has existed in Christianity does not mean that it was distinctively Christian. It was the universal accompaniment of a particular theory of disease, viz., that disease is the result of demonic influence or possession. Jesus

claimed no exclusive power either for himself or his followers in effecting these cures. The whole point of the Beelzebub controversy is lost if others did not perform cures in the same way: "If I cast out demons by Beelzebub, by whom do your sons cast them out." Every cure was a struggle of supernatural forces, in which the holy (or friendly) spirit permitted itself to be used by the healer to overcome the influence of an evil (or hostile) spirit.

What can be said, however, in defense of the revival of these practices without the revival of the theory of disease which gave them birth? An intellectual difficulty of some proportions faces the Church if it is to revive the healing ministry of apostolic times. Is the Church to reaffirm the doctrine of demon possession, or is some new theory of diagnosis to be proposed as a complement to the revival of ancient therapeutics? The objection to a skeptical attitude in regard to faith-healing will always be raised, that these cures often really work and that many people are actually made better. It is quite true that a healthy equilibrium may be restored to an overwrought nervous system by the removal of worry, and that this can be achieved by the states of faith and hope induced by the faith-cure. It is also true that other methods of removing worry are equally successful. It has been found that many troubles which have been regarded as organic are really due to disturbances in the nervous system. These can be cured by an improvement in the nervous condition of the patient, which may be effected by a faith cure. These faith cures are in all cases dependent, as the name suggests, on the belief in their effectiveness. Without this nothing can be accomplished. The real harm in the faith cure is not that it works by virtue of convincing people that their condition is other than it is, but because it tends to depreciate the accurate investigation of disease and its cure by science. People are always ready to welcome short cuts to knowledge, and religion has been the most

attractive of all. In none of the spheres in which it has been applied has the method of observation and investigation yielded more fruitful and beneficial results than in medicine. To attempt to depreciate this work or to offer substitutes for it that are not founded on fact is to stand in the way not only of scientific progress but of the preservation and advancement of human life.

As a piece of liturgical reconstruction the Report is undoubtedly admirable. The Church will, however, be making a serious error if it accepts or rejects its suggestions merely on that basis, and permits the theological issues raised by many of the proposed changes to escape, if not settlement, at least a more general fruitful discussion than they have yet received. The whole question of prayer could profitably be opened, and the propriety considered of having petitions to change the weather and the states of people's health used by a generation which believes neither change capable of being made by supernatural interference with the course of nature. This suggests the still wider question of whether the Church ought any longer to teach prayer as a species of contract, in which man induces God, as it were against his better judgment, to manage things differently from the way in which He had originally intended. It is hardly possible to see how this view can be reconciled with the modern idea of nature as a fixed sequence of events. Questions like these are fundamental "modern needs," which the Church cannot afford to neglect if she is any longer to pretend to minister to the educated. Liturgy, to be a real aid to devotion, must express the experiences and aspirations of its users. It cannot do this if it exalts flagrant misrepresentations of facts and embodies anciently respectable but really untrue views.

BOOK REVIEWS

MY GENERATION. AN AUTOBIOGRAPHICAL INTERPRETATION. WILLIAM JEWETT TUCKER. The Houghton Mifflin Co. 1919. Pp. xvi, 464. \$4.00.

President Tucker explains in the Preface the signification of the title:

"There must be, of course, some reason for that backward errand of the mind which is implied in autobiography; 'Confessions,' maybe they frequently are, the work of the imagination; but when genuine they have their justification in the unburdening of a mind of its past. 'Reminiscences' of lighter vein are the recreation of the mind; in more serious vein, its revaluation of men and events according to the appraisal of the memory. 'Interpretation' represents most nearly the unfinished works of a lifetime. In its more personal use it offers to the individual worker a just relief from his frequent sense of the incompleteness and the impermanence of his work, by allowing him to relate it to things which have in themselves fullness and stability, movements, causes, institutions. Applied in its larger relations, it may make some unfinished work of a generation, through the better understanding of it, the special task of the next, and so maintain that continuity of purpose among like-minded men which is the essential element in social progress."

This retrospection is arranged by periods — the Personal Background of Ancestry, Early Home, School and College; the Environment of a Civil War; the Profession of the Ministry; the Andover Period; the Dartmouth Period; the New Reservation of Time. While divided into periods chronologically, it is really the evolution of a life from youth to manhood, and in settings of office which were places of influence — preaching, teaching, administering, and at last prophesying.

He says of his upbringing in what might be called a Puritan home at Plymouth, New Hampshire, the home of his uncle, Rev. William R. Jewett: "As I recall my own experiences in a Puritan home and those of my mates, I have little sympathy with the men of my generation who attribute any subsequent licence on their part in morals and religion to the strictness of their early training. The home life of that period, as I saw it, had found the normal balance between authority and indulgence. There were exceptions, but I am inclined to think that a good many of the uncomfortable experiences which linger in the minds of some men should be charged to the narrowness

or temper or obstinacy of individual parents rather than to Puritanism. And due account should be kept as we grow older with the results of our own youthful mischiefs and follies. Whatever the Puritan home may have been aforetime I know only by report, but when it became the home for my generation, it stood for a material, intelligent, and reasonably free approach to a world."

He prepared for college at the County Academy, was graduated from Dartmouth College in 1861, taught for a time in Columbus, Ohio, entered Andover Theological Seminary in 1863, served a year in the United States Christian Commission, caring for the wounded in hospitals and on the march to Atlanta, and returned to Andover, graduating in 1866.

He writes of the teaching of the Andover professors at that time, particularly of that burning and shining light, Professor Edwards A. Park: "As theology was treated by Professor Park, the lectures became the attraction and stimulus of the seminary course. I can hardly go further and affirm with equal assurance their inspirational quality. . . . It (Andover) represented an advanced theology, keen intellectual life, and the spirit of devotion for service at home and abroad. What was lacking, and the lack was serious, was some fresh, more direct, and penetrating approach to the heart of Christianity. The theological advance from Old to New School had created an unmistakable feeling of satisfaction. The 'New England Theology' was quite too near the finished article. Like every great religious holding of the truth, it was vitalized at times by spiritual quickenings, but the continuous struggle after truth, the tremendous earnestness of search rather than of inquiry, the conflict with doubt, the baffled but determined demand for personal assurance and personal possession, were not conspicuously in evidence."

Then came his pastorate of eight years at Manchester, New Hampshire, a manufacturing town, and at the Madison Square Church, New York, continuing five years. He was called to Andover Theological Seminary in 1879 to be professor of Homiletics.

More than a hundred pages of the book are given to the Andover Movement and the trial of five of its professors — Smyth, Tucker, Churchill, Harris, Hincks — on charges of heterodoxy, that is, of departure from the Creed of the Seminary, which the professors were required to subscribe, not only at their inauguration but again every fifth year. Although there were sixteen specific charges, the attack was at two sensitive points — probation after death or second probation, and the real authority of the Bible. The attention of a religious world was caught. Not only the religious press but also the secular

press gave large space to the discussions. It is thirty-four years since the trial was instituted by the Board of Visitors, and twenty-eight years since the Supreme Court of Massachusetts reversed the verdict. It is not easy now to make the younger generation, or indeed anybody, understand what it was all about. Yet the Andover Movement was on the line of theological and religious progress.

The Constitution of the Seminary provides two Boards: the Trustees, twelve in number, the majority laymen, who administer the affairs of the Seminary and elect professors; the Visitors, three in number, two clergymen and one layman, to be guardians of the Foundation, to interpret the Creed as occasion might require, to examine the professors elected by the Trustees, to take care that the duties of every professor are intelligently and faithfully discharged, and to admonish or remove, either for misbehavior, heterodoxy, incapacity, or neglect of the duties of his office — That was the situation when the five professors who were editors of the *Andover Review* were charged by a few of the older alumni with heresy, and before the Visitors the charges were brought. Each side had counsel; the courtroom — a dining-room in the United States Hotel, Boston — was thronged for five days. Professor Smyth made a convincing defense, the other four professors made brief addresses, the lawyers stepped in with able arguments, and the trial was over. The evidence of heterodoxy adduced by the complainants consisted of editorials in the *Andover Review*, for which, being unsigned, all the editors were responsible. The Trustees' request that they might be a party to the trial was refused by the Visitors.

Six months later the decision of the Visitors was given. Professor Smyth was removed and the others were not removed, although the evidence was precisely the same for all. Two Visitors voted for Professor Smyth's removal; one (President Ledge of Amherst College, the President of the Board), for acquittal. When the other professors were considered, one of the Visitors did not vote; and since in that case, two voting, one for and one against — the vote of the President of the Board determined — they were not removed. Appeal was made to the Supreme Court of Massachusetts, as provided by the Constitution, and five years later, the Court ruled that the decision in the case of Professor Smyth was invalid, because the Trustees, whose agents the professors are, were not allowed to be a party to the trial. Later the composition of the Board of Visitors having changed, they reversed the decision to remove Professor Smyth.

The American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions took up the issue of what was popularly called future probation. The

Prudential Committee would not appoint as a missionary any one who even said that he did not know the fate of the heathen. There were animated discussions at the annual meetings of the Board. The Congregational churches were involved. Councils were ordaining young men who entertained the opinion for holding which the Board was rejecting them. Finally at the Worcester Meeting in 1893, the Board was given over to the control of the churches, which thenceforth were to elect members of a Board.

"The result which was most definitely secured through the protracted trial, the result, that is, which was actually reached, and which could only have been reached through conflict, was a reasonable assurance of theological freedom. The result was the answer to those who deprecated the fight and would have been willing to divert the issue. It represented something achieved, something won. Between the original judgment and its reversal, public sentiment had grown into an almost unanimous approval of the freedom secured. Very few feared any danger from it. The long struggle had familiarized the public mind with the spirit and intent of a larger freedom. . . . The great struggle within the field of doctrine has always been to break the hold of fettering and restrictive dogmas. These dogmas have been the obstructive forces in the way of a working Christianity — the dogma of a particular election, the dogma of a limited atonement, and last, the dogma of a restricted opportunity. It was a sad comment on the assumed and even boasted freedom of the New England theology, of which Andover was a chief exponent, that a theology which had won the conflict for a universal atonement should surrender to the dogma of a restricted Christian opportunity, and that the missionary organization called into being to carry out the motive of a universal atonement should shift its motive of action to this same dogma of a restricted Christian opportunity. . . . The greatest advance of Christian doctrine within this generation has been in its humanity. The humanizing process has been at work in many ways, but, in all those ways that are most accessible and most easily recognized, it has been stimulated by that larger hope for humanity which is the outcome and the expression of the newly-acquired freedom of Christianity. . . . Is there a larger work in human redemption going on out of sight, but not out of the reach of faith? The Christian heart and the Christian mind and more and more the Christian conscience have contended for the right to believe in this unlimited work of Christ."

More than one hundred and fifty pages of the book are given to the Dartmouth period. Dr. Tucker was President of the college from

1893 to 1909, when he retired on account of impaired health. The years of limited activity which might follow he has called "The New Reservation of Time," the title of an article in the *Atlantic Monthly* in 1910. "In this article," he says, "I endeavoured to show the changed attitude in which it is possible under this restriction to approach that un hoped serene that men call age." His reservation is already more than ten years, in which he has done a surprising amount of literary work.

The Dartmouth period witnessed the development and enlargement of the college, in numbers from four hundred in 1893 to fourteen hundred in 1909. Dr. Tucker presents his theory of a liberal education, of a democratic college, touches on athletics and the many "outside interests," and gives the history of the college, with a full account of the Dartmouth case and the famous plea of Daniel Webster. While this survey of collegiate education and collegiate life is of special interest to Dartmouth men, it is significant to all who are concerned with the higher education needed and demanded in our time.

President Tucker's predominant interest, as he himself says, is the social, the humanitarian. He was the first, I think, to introduce social ethics in the instruction of a theological seminary — at any rate, among the first. He lectured on Social Economics, the Social Evolution of Labor; and kindred subjects. He established the Andover House, a social settlement in Boston, in 1892, later called the South End House.

In general, he says: "In the estimation of the causes which affected the fortune of my generation according to its place in the order of time, I put without hesitating the incoming of the new social order, consequent upon the rise of industrialism. The incoming of the new social order was in reality a social revolution, though lacking most of the usual signs of violence. For it was nothing less than the change from the individualistic basis of society to the collective basis, or if we do not allow the political implication of the term, to the socialistic basis. This revolutionary change reached far beyond the limits of industrialism. Still the results were most quickly and most extensively manifest within those limits. Capital rapidly passed from the hands of the individual into the control of the corporation, and thence into the control of the trust. Labor passed in like manner and with equal steps from the control of the individual to that of the Union, and on to that of the federation. Capitalist and workman alike placed themselves under self-imposed limitations. They allowed themselves to disappear as individuals to reappear as members of

organizations. Business in general passed from the stage of individual control to that of collective bargaining."

"The political effect of the change in the social order has thus far been much less than was thought probable, much less in fact than might have been expected. The advance on the socialistic basis has stopped far short of socialism. . . . Our government has gradually become more socialistic in its working without making any appreciable approach to Socialism. . . . The religious effect of the social revolution was in some respects deeper and more far-reaching than the political effect. It changed the prevailing type of religion. Individualism had been the foundation of the Protestant faith. Now, men began to think in terms of social Christianity. . . . The Church became as conspicuously the agency for 'social service' as it had been the 'means of grace' in the work of individual salvation."

President Tucker's book is a clear exposition of the tendencies — religious, educational, social, political — of his generation, on all of which he was influential. The personal touch is felt in the characteristic, elevated style, and in the appraisal of those movements in which he bore a conspicuous part.

GEORGE HARRIS.

NEW YORK.

DICTIONARY OF THE APOSTOLIC CHURCH. Edited by James Hastings, with the assistance of John A. Selbie, and John C. Lambert. 2 vols. 1916, 1918. Charles Scribner's Sons. Vol. I, pp. xiv, 729; Vol. II, pp. xii, 724. \$12.00.

The resemblance of this new dictionary, in inner and outer appearance, to the same editor's previous dictionaries of the Bible is not deceptive. It is a similar work. Together with the *Dictionary of Christ and the Gospels* this new work forms with some overlapping a complete dictionary of the New Testament in four volumes — the same space that Dr. Hastings originally devoted in the first work to the whole Bible. This larger scale of treatment is shown not only by the length of the articles but by the greater inclusiveness of the new work.

Besides the canonical writings of the New Testament, the Apocryphal Gospels and Acts are dealt with, and a separate article is given to most (why not all?) of both the Apostolic Fathers and the principal Jewish apocalypses. The latter are written mostly by pupils of R. H. Charles and reproduce unchanged the master's positions, but Burkitt on the "Apocalypse of Baruch" is independent and almost polemic, while Moffatt writes with his usual encyclopædic knowledge upon

the "Sibylline Oracles." This same writer supplies also what is perhaps the most remote excursus from the limited field of the Apostolic Church in the article on "War." This long monograph (it is exceeded in length only by the article on the "Resurrection of Christ") is a fascinating study, rich in literary allusion, of the relation to war of Judaism, of the teaching of Jesus and the apostles, and of the teaching and practice of the ante-Nicene Church. It is almost a pity that it is buried in a dictionary, for at least at the time of publication the subject was of special interest. It is also a pity that the author should in this and even in his other article have embodied the spirit of the time and should not have made a somewhat more impartial presentation of the position of the Christian Fathers. The monograph by C. J. Cadoux, which appeared at about the same time, endorsed by Professor Harnack as settling the case, should be read as a corrective with this article.

One very satisfactory series of articles deals with contemporary secular history. The main articles, on the several Emperors, on "Roads and Travel," etc., are by Alexander Souter, the rest by James Strahan. They are complete, succinct, and accurate. For "Hellenistic and Biblical Greek" the late Professor Thumb of Strassburg was requisitioned, and he has provided here a summary of the status of the linguistic problem in a fuller and more judicial fashion than is done by any other English writing.

A series of long and important articles discusses questions of New Testament theology, as Atonement, Conversion, Eschatology, Grace, Inspiration and Revelation, Law, Love, Perseverance, Preëxistence, Righteousness. Some of those by better known writers are Inspiration and Revelation by W. Sanday, and Righteousness by J. Moffatt. No doubt the contributors to the *Dictionary* represent nearly as much variety of viewpoint as existed in the Apostolic Age itself. One gets, however, from these articles an impression of less conservatism than in the *Dictionary of Christ and the Gospels*. Under the timeworn rubrics of theology the qualities of Christian experience and the teaching of the New Testament often receive a fresh and vigorous presentation. This impression of liberalism is confirmed by the attitude toward questions of authorship. In the articles on the several New Testament books traditional authorship is emphatically stated only in the case of Paul's main letters; elsewhere the writer either gives fairly the arguments on both sides or plainly opposes the traditional view.

The writers in the main are in British colleges and pulpits. A striking proportion represent the Free Churches; but a considerable use

has been made of American scholars. Perhaps the comparative lack of continental contributors was due to the difficulties of language and, in the case of the second volume, to the war. The articles, however, by Pierre Batiffol on "Ignatius" and "Polycarp" and of Ernst von Dobschütz on "Josephus" and "Philo" show that French and German scholarship have not been overlooked.

It is a fault, however, that the bibliographical material from Germany has sometimes been neglected. There is, for example, no reference to Norden's *Agnostos Theos*, s. v., "Unknown Gods," nor to Böhlig, *Geisteskultur von Tarsus*, s. v., "Tarsus," (both published in 1913). There is no reference to Wendland's important article on σωτήρ (ZNTW, 1904, 335 ff.) s. v., "Saviour," nor to Schürer's article in the same periodical (ZNTW, 1905, 1 ff.) on *Die siebentägige Woche in der christl. Kirche des ersten Jahrhunderts*, s. v., "Week" or "Sabbath" or "Lord's Day." There is apparently no reference to the Göttingen monographs on the *Book of Acts* by Schwartz (1907) and Wellhausen (1914). There is no suggestion s. v. "Assumption of Moses" that Schürer's view that the author was a zealot was subsequently (1909) abandoned by him. Similarly the article on the "Resurrection of Christ," already mentioned, fails entirely to use or even mention the most able liberal book in English on the topic — C. R. Bowen's *The Resurrection in the New Testament*.

These and some other minor faults that could be mentioned (omissions, misprints, and especially contradictions due to composite authorship) do not, however, invalidate the great value of this work of reference for scholars and particularly for ministers and laymen generally. Of course it is no substitute or short cut for solid and direct study of the Apostolic Age. The wide use of such material as is here both presented and referred to would create the intelligent and well-founded Christian knowledge which is often so woefully lacking in the present-day ministry and teaching of the Bible. It is, of course, difficult to give more than a fragmentary impression of so extensive and varied a production. But if the reviewer's impression is accurate, we have before us a new monument to the accumulated scholarship of the past and a landmark of progress toward an untrammelled historic reconstruction of the thought and spirit of the Apostolic Age.

HENRY J. CADBURY.

ANDOVER THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY.

PREHISTORIC RELIGION, A STUDY IN PRE-CHRISTIAN ANTIQUITY. PHILO LAOS MILLS. Capitol Publishers, Washington. 1918. Pp. xix, 600.

This book, the result of ten years of labor on the part of the author, is issued under the imprimatur of the learned and saintly Cardinal Archbishop of Baltimore. Its six hundred pages, containing an examination of the religious beliefs of the Oceanic, Central African, and Amazonian Primitives, are rich in material which may throw light backward on the earliest religion of mankind. One may well find oneself unable to agree with the author in certain views which he holds in common with many of his Communion, that "primitive man was undoubtedly an ideal and unique being," and that "hence all the existing savage beliefs are more or less tainted, but exhibit greater or less approximations to absolute truth in proportion to their antiquity or to the purity with which the primitive revelation has been handed down." Yet the book being preëminently a thesaurus, a source-book on social and religious origins, made up largely of well-selected quotations from and references to the works of Tylor, Frazer, Lang, Cumont, Dhorme, Codrington, Chamberlain, Howitt, Schmidt, Jastrow, Maas, LeRoy, and a host of others, the views of the author, cited above, sink into the background. Over one hundred illustrations add to the interest and value of the book.

MAX KELLNER.

THE EPISCOPAL THEOLOGICAL SCHOOL.

SELECTED TEMPLE DOCUMENTS OF THE UR DYNASTY. CLARENCE E. KEISER. Yale Oriental Series. Babylonian Texts, Vol. IV. Yale University Press, 1919. Pp. 54. Plates xc.

PATESIS OF THE UR DYNASTY. CLARENCE E. KEISER. Yale Oriental Series. Researches, Vol. IV, 2. Yale University Press. 1919. Pp. 34.

Professor Clay and his students are continuing their praiseworthy task of presenting the texts of the Yale Babylonian Collection to scholars as quickly as possible, without waiting to translate them and comment upon them in detail. In this, the fourth, volume of Babylonian Texts from the Yale Collection, Dr. Keiser has published a selection of those inscriptions which contain material of the greatest value for the reconstruction of the political and civil life of the southern Babylonians of the thirtieth century before Christ. He has autographed three hundred and twenty-three texts, covering ninety plates, and has done so in such a way as to reproduce as nearly as possible the form and character of the original script. The texts are excellently copied. In his fifty-four pages of introduction, the author

has discussed the provenance of the texts, has collected many new and variant date-formulæ for the Dynasty of Ur, and in a series of indices has collected the personal names, the names of deities, the names of temples, houses, sacred objects, places, canals, and gates; after which follows a useful catalogue with a summary of the contents of the various texts.

Dr. Keiser has divided his texts into groups: contracts and loans, those relating to patesis, those containing chronological data, those containing orders, those concerning temple business, and those of a miscellaneous character. Individually these tablets are not very interesting. They belong to the well known Business Contracts. But now and then very valuable material is found. This is especially true in chronological and linguistic matters. New dates, new names, and new signs are constantly arising.

The chronological material in these tablets has been found in such abundance that Dr. Keiser has thought it desirable to write a separate monograph on the patesis of the Ur Dynasty, arranging them in a chronological manner. He has also brought them into synchronistic relationship with the patesis of Umma, Nippur, and Lagash, making some interesting additions to our extant lists of patesis. This becomes evident if one compares his table at the end with that in King's *Sumer and Akkad*, p. 362.

But what is of more general importance is the conclusions which Dr. Keiser has arrived at in his study of the status, duties, and nature of the patesiate. He finds that the patesis of the Ur Dynasty, unlike those of earlier periods, did not recognize a dynastic succession; that the office of patesi had waned in influence since the time of Gudea, when the patesi was supreme ruler; that the patesi could be transferred or deposed; that he was not exempt from tithes, and from supplying animals for sacrifice; that he became a temple functionary; that he assumed, on occasions, the character of a magistrate; and that he carried on various relations, commercial and otherwise, with the patesis of other cities. Dr. Keiser does not say so, but the chances are that in the earlier periods, such as in the time of Eannatum, the patesi was really king, but that with the amalgamation of certain cities and the increased power of certain great patesis, the patesis of smaller towns became dependent and lost much of their original power, being reduced to the status of governors or temple functionaries. However this may be, Dr. Keiser has again placed all students of early Babylonian history and linguistics in his debt by the clear and scientific way in which he has presented this new batch of cuneiform material. The time is fast approaching when a fairly well

constructed chronology of the early Babylonian dynasties can be presented. One misses a reference for comparative purposes to F. Thureau-Dangin's recent and excellent study, *La Chronologie des Dynasties de Sumer et d'Accad* (1918), as well as a sufficient use of G. Contenau, *Umma sous la Dynastie d'Ur* (1916).

Many of these texts throw confirmatory light upon the social and ethical ideas of early Babylonia. Text No. 6, of the first year of Ibi-Sin, is a document in which a father takes oath in the presence of the patesi concerning the selling of his son to another person. The father has complete authority over his children, authority of the same nature as that over his cattle or real estate. No. 67 shows the way in which slaves were procured and set aside for the use of temples.

In a series of appendices to the monograph, Dr. Keiser collects the names of *Shakkanakku* of the Ur Dynasty, arranging them according to place and time; and enumerates the names of the princes and princesses of the reigns of Dungi, Bur-Sin, and Ibi-Sin, there being recorded no children of Gimil-Sin. The long chronological list of patesis of the Ur Dynasty adds much to our knowledge of the political life of early Babylonia. In his Synchronistic List it is worthy of note that Dr. Keiser makes Gudea a contemporary of Bur-Sin. This is much later than King's date for him.

It is now the privilege of the student of cuneiform to make use of these many texts so generously made accessible to him by the Yale authorities.

SAMUEL A. B. MERCER.

WESTERN THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY.

THE SOURCES OF THE HEXATEUCH. EDGAR SHEFFIELD BRIGHTMAN. The Abingdon Press. 1918. Pp. 395. \$3.00.

Scholarship has been at work for about a century and a half on the problem of the composition of the first six books of the Old Testament, the Hexateuch. An enormous amount of writing has been done and many widely differing views have been set forth during those years; but out of the debate there has come forth a constantly increasing body of facts on which there has been a consensus of opinion. The result attained has been that today not only the scholars in the field of Old Testament learning but also a large majority of the more scholarly clergy are convinced by the evidence adduced that the documentary hypothesis is the only solution of the problem. Almost thirty years ago George Foote Moore wrote to Benjamin Wisner Bacon (Bacon: *Genesis of Genesis*, p. xxix), "There is no reason to think

that the general results on which critics now agree will be overturned." They have not only not been overturned, but their foundations have been strengthened and made more impregnable. But this acceptance of the more scientific view has been largely confined to the scholars and the more carefully trained ministry. The laymen have as a rule been too lacking in scholarly equipment and too busy to sift the more or less confused evidence involved, to be converted to a general acceptance of the new view. The consequence has therefore been a gap between the pulpit and the pews. It is just such books as this of Dr. Brightman's on the sources of the Hexateuch that are adapted to relieve this unfortunate condition. The book is especially felicitous in its presentation of results and in a form easily understood. The three large documents are given in their entirety: the Judæan or Jahvistic document, dating from about the middle of the ninth century B.C., the Ephraimitic or Elohist document, dating from about a century later, and the Priestly Code, from about 500 B.C. To each of these the author gives an introduction, descriptive of its literary characteristics, its ideals, and the home of its author or editors. Thus the reader is prepared to note how characteristically the earlier two differ from each other and how radically these two earlier accounts, which had their origin in prophetic circles of thought, differ from the theocratic tone and presentation of the later Priestly Code. Dr. Brightman's book is commended to those who are really anxious to see what the modern critical method has done for the Hexateuch. From the introduction, in which is given a brief but valuable outline of the history of the criticism, to the bibliography with which it closes, the book is marked by good scholarship and wise restraint.

MAX KELLNER.

THE EPISCOPAL THEOLOGICAL SCHOOL.

THEOLOGY AS AN EMPIRICAL SCIENCE. D. C. MACINTOSH. The Macmillan Co. 1919. Pp. xvi, 270. \$2.00.

This is an exceptionally fresh and stimulating book on theology written by the Dwight professor of Theology in Yale University. Not that its conclusions are novel, for they are substantially those of so-called Liberal Orthodoxy more squarely stated and consistently held, but it is the way of reaching them which is noteworthy. There has been much loose talk of late about experience as the basis of theology, and the empirical method as alone valid for theological construction; but little definite work of the sort indicated has actually been attempted save in the psychology of conversion. Moreover, the

use of the term has been painfully vague; where reason failed, it has sometimes been deemed sufficient to pronounce that blessed word "experience," with hushed voice and awful mien, for the exorcism of a doubting or denying spirit. But Dr. Macintosh cannot away with such nonsense, and the distinction of his book is that it does undertake to define the data and apply the methods of experience with accuracy and thoroughness. As a theologian Dr. Macintosh has at hand certain presuppositions — the existence of God as object of religious dependence, the reality of freedom, the possibility of immortality — and certain data of revelation in the person and work of Christ and in personal salvation and support, together with the laws which may be formulated on the basis of these experiences. Thus equipped, he proceeds to a closer definition of the idea of God, and to a study of providence, eschatology, and theodicy in the light of this more developed concept. Probably most readers will feel, and rightly, that the last chapter, on the problem of evil, containing the substance of an earlier publication entitled *God in a World at War*, is a remarkably vital and original contribution to theological thought.

The book is open to criticism at several points, but there is space here for only a few fundamental doubts and suggestions. Is there not just a little too much flourishing of the words "science" and "scientific"? One need not be an anti-intellectualist to wonder whether science exhausts reality and a scientific method is the only way to truth. On the other hand, a thoroughly shut-in man of science (if such a creature be not as mythical as the economic man) might fairly protest that when God (however imperfectly defined), freedom, and immortality are accepted as presuppositions, there has been a begging of the question at the outset. Perhaps a mathematician would gloat over the author's formula for determining moral value with reference (1) to the isolated wrong act, and (2) to the man as a whole, "The numerator of the fraction represents . . . the factors according to which the guilt varies directly, and the denominator the factors according to which it varies inversely," (p. 85); but a reader whose

$$(1) \frac{(EI) \cdot (EM) \cdot (PF) \cdot (SD) \cdot (gi) \cdot (gm) \cdot (GHU) \cdot (GHC) \cdot (GTU) \cdot (GTS)}{(GI) \cdot (GM) \cdot (ei) \cdot (em) \cdot (EHU) \cdot (EHC) \cdot (ETU) \cdot (ETS)}.$$

$$(2) \frac{(EI) \cdot (EM) \cdot (PF) \cdot (SD) \cdot (gi) \cdot (gm) \cdot (GHU) \cdot (EHC) \cdot (GTU) \cdot (ETS)}{(GI) \cdot (GM) \cdot (ei) \cdot (em) \cdot (EHU) \cdot (GHC) \cdot (ETU) \cdot (GTS)}.$$

interests are moral and religious asks in bewilderment what has become of the traditional doctrine of the simplicity of moral action, and what is the use of a formula which enables no one, least of all the sinner himself, to estimate blameworthiness? Dante's Minos would

have to be an advanced mathematician and work overtime, in order to assign the damned to their appropriate circles in hell.

How is it possible to justify the assumption constantly made that we must believe in a God adequate to the religious needs of man? Those needs are so diverse that a god adequate to them all would seem to be in danger of having no character at all. Nor is the difficulty removed by prefixing such adjectives as "real," "valid," "deep," "legitimate," which in fact simply exclude all religious needs with which the author does not sympathize. Besides, is it not possible that the need has been created by long-continued belief in a supply? Taught to rely on divine aid, men easily formulate their craving for assistance against the hostile forces of nature into an imperative need of God as all-powerful helper. There may easily be "the upbuilding of a need" by the promise of a supply. At any rate, to assume that there must be satisfaction for all the "deepest" needs of man is quite too much of a presupposition to be thoroughly scientific.

The chief criticism, however, concerns the transition from psychology to ontology. In the intricate and baffling complex of religious experience, can it be positively affirmed that elements are included which demand an objective factor for their explanation? It may be true that in ordinary experience, objects and not ideas are immediate data, or that it is sufficient to plead an "ontological consciousness" in proof of an external world, but in religious experience the case is not so clear. As the author often says, right relations must be established if the experience is to ensue; but such a right relation is of course a psychological state, and a psychological condition as predisposing cause may turn out to be a sufficient effective cause of the experience which follows. One is tempted to employ the author's method in other ways and with respect to other experiences. To say nothing of the help and healing which often follow prayers directed to the Virgin or the saints, there are experiences of temptation in which one seems beset by an alien power enticing, even compelling, to evil. Shall we argue from such experiences to the reality of evil spirits and of Satan? Dr. Macintosh recognizes this peril at the very close of the book but does not offer a satisfactory reply. Perhaps those who accused disbelievers in the devil with atheism could have made out a good case on the basis and by the methods of empirical theology.

W. W. FENN.

HARVARD UNIVERSITY.

THE PROGRESS OF CHURCH FEDERATION. CHARLES S. MACFARLAND.
Fleming H. Revell Co. 1917. Pp. 191. \$1.00.

This small volume contains a brief record of the proceedings and activities of the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America, boiled down by the General Secretary of the Council from the earlier volumes which describe the origin of the Federation and from its annual reports.

Though the work of the Federal Council has not gone very far, it may at least be said that it is a step in the right direction, and that the method of federation is sound in principle, even if in practice it has not been carried out in as catholic a spirit as the writer of this book would have one believe. The Massachusetts Federation of Churches presents a better example of inclusiveness. Taken as a whole, however, the Council has perhaps accomplished quite as much as it is reasonable to expect. Its best work — up to the time of the publication of this volume — has been that outlined in the chapter on "The Development of Federation in Nation, State, City, and Town," which summarizes the result of various investigations conducted under the auspices of the Council. The best known of these is that which resulted in the volume on "The Country Church" by Messrs. Gill and Pinchot. But other investigations uncovered equally interesting situations, as, for example, the fact that in San Francisco a larger percentage of Chinese than of Caucasians are communicants in evangelical churches.

Since the publication of this book the Federal Council has done an important war-time service which some future volume will doubtless report. It is to be hoped that in addition to the bibliographies which the present book contains such future reports may also be indexed.

HENRY WILDER FOOTE.

HARVARD UNIVERSITY.

THE CONSCIENCE AND CONCESSIONS. HOW MAY THE INDIVIDUAL BECOME RELATED TO THE MANY? ALFRED WILLIAMS ANTHONY. Fleming H. Revell Co. Pp. 370.

This book contains an interesting though somewhat discursive treatment of the tendencies of our time towards coöperation and federation, social, political, and religious. Most of the chapters have grown from lecture-courses and still bear the style of the lecturer. They contain many statements of obvious facts, often skim the surface of the subject, and never go into too great detail or display reasoning too

profound to be grasped by a popular audience. The author nevertheless comes at times to close grips with vital points of the crucial problems and always treats them in sane and helpful ways.

The scope of the book is indicated by the titles of the chapters, which are: "The Historic Movement towards Unity," "The Unifying Tendencies of War," "The Protests of Individualism," "The 'Dead Hand' of Organization," "The New Testament Balance between the Individual and Society," "The Broad Basis of Brotherhood and Social Obligation," "National Unity from the Christian Point of View," "The Social Assimilation of Christianity," "Protestant Excursions in Christian Solidarity," "A Practical Program of Valid Concessions."

The emphasis throughout is placed on the tendencies which make for unity. It is, however, recognized that there is a danger that the movement toward unity may go so fast as to be superficial. In the last chapter the fact that the concessions necessary to unity involve a recognition of the varying mental processes of different people and their right to different expressions of conscientious conviction, is well stated. Without this recognition no toleration is possible. It is well said by the author that such recognition is one of the most difficult steps for many to take.

Especially felicitous is the analysis on pp. 63, 64 of the way many persons confuse facts and principles with obligations; on p. 70 of the necessity of fidelity to conscience; on p. 108 of the preëminence of the Christ; on pp. 167-173 of the relation of conscience to government; on p. 192 of the impossibility of confining Christianity to peculiar forms or convictions; on p. 259 of the occasions which impose restraints upon the free expression of conviction; and on p. 269 of the necessity of socializing the individual.

But one misstatement has been noted in the book. That is on p. 38, where it is said of the recent war: "No nation on the side of the Allies set out for the annexation of territory, not even to rectify a boundary or straighten a border." Strongly pro-Ally as the reviewer is, he must protest that there was on the side of the Allies at least one exception to this statement.

To the reviewer it appears that Dr. Anthony's program does not go far enough, admirable in many ways as his statement is. A program for Christian union should have in view as a goal — at least a distant goal — the union of all Christians of whatever name. It should, he thinks, be sufficiently flexible to include people of every stage of culture and scientific or unscientific point of view. It should aim to preserve the variety of types and tastes that are now included in various

branches and sects of the Eastern, the Roman, and the Protestant branches of Christianity. For this ever to be accomplished, it will be necessary for all Christians to come to the point where they can accept something like the famous Quadrilateral of the Lambeth and Chicago conferences as a working basis of general organization. It will be necessary, on the other hand, for those Christians who delight to call themselves "Catholic" or "Orthodox" to cease to insist that any particular theory of the bishopric, the Church, or any particular interpretation of the creeds is necessary. Men who hold the scientific views of the twentieth century must be permitted to understand these things in a way consistent with their intellectual outlook, just as really as those who still occupy the intellectual standpoint of Thomas Aquinas, Radbertus, or of the Second Council of Nicæa. In a Church so constituted and so liberally conducted, the different types of Protestantism could be included as religious orders. Liberty could be accorded these orders for the type of worship that best ministers to the taste and temperament of its members; but there would be a sense of unity and oneness from the fact that all belong to the same Church. It seems to the reviewer that some such approach as this to the problem might in time be fruitful, but in view of the deep convictions of many that they and they only are right, he is aware that for a long time to come such a program has little chance of success. A long period of education in toleration is necessary. It will take a good deal of what James Russell Lowell once called "settin' up and wooin'" to bring such a program within the range of possibility.

GEORGE A. BARTON.

BRYN MAWR.

MIND AND CONDUCT. HENRY RUTGERS MARSHALL. Charles Scribner's Sons. 1919. Pp. x, 236. \$1.75.

This volume contains the Morse Lectures delivered at Union Theological Seminary in 1919. Dr. Marshall divides his argument into three parts. The first, on *The Correlation of Mind and Conduct*, contains chapters on "Consciousness and Behavior," "Instinct and Reason," and "The Self." The second, on *Some Implications of the Correlation*, deals with "Creativeness and Ideals" and "Freedom and Responsibility." The third, on *Guides to Conduct*, examines "Pleasure and Pain," "Happiness," and "Intuition and Reason," along the general lines with which students of philosophy have been made familiar in Dr. Marshall's previous books on *Pain, Pleasure, and*

Aesthetics, and on *Instinct and Reason*, just as the first part is based on his *Consciousness*. There are, lastly, two Appendices, on "The Causal Relation between Mind and Body," and on "Outer-World Objects."

Laboratory-psychologists, averse to all speculative flights and anxious only to keep their psychology within the sober limits of a natural science, will probably look askance at Dr. Marshall's book. But for students of human conduct who are not afraid of viewing man in a cosmic context there is much in these lectures to arrest attention. I would point especially to the following doctrines which are fundamental for Dr. Marshall's whole argument.

1. There is his outspoken panpsychism: "As a logical extension of our habitual mode of attribution of consciousness to animals by the interpretation of animal behavior, we are not only forced to grant some form of consciousness to all forms of living matter, but we are led to look upon the Universe as itself pulsating with psychic life" (p. 89). I must confess that Dr. Marshall's very brief argument in support of this position carries no conviction to my mind. The only promising way, it seems to me, of reaching the conclusion that the Universe is pulsating with psychic life, is not to stretch analogy far beyond the breaking point in a *descent* from man through animal and plant to inorganic matter, but to *ascend* from the human mind, or, to speak more precisely, to develop the metaphysical implications of knowledge, morality, and religion.

2. Not only is the Universe a single psychic life, but every self is part of that life and determined within it. "We perceive that in holding that our acts are governed by the laws of Nature, the mechanist is really stating that the acts of the self are such as force us to believe this self to be part and parcel of Nature. And this notion we have seen to be eminently satisfactory; first, because we cannot without dismay look upon ourselves as stray waifs in this vast Universe; and especially because it means that the interpretation of Nature must include the interpretation of consciousness" (p. 101). Thence Dr. Marshall derives his theory of freedom. The self is always free, for it acts always in accord with its own nature. There are not, and cannot be, any forces "external" to it, to the compulsion of which it is subject. For the self "must be what it is because of the whole situation in the great system of Nature, of which great system it is a minor part. . . . The conditions of this system are thus of the essence of its [the self's] nature" (pp. 102, 103). To put it quite simply: the self is free because, as a part of the Universe, it must be what it is. If this seems an outrageous verbalism, it is only

because Dr. Marshall does not go the whole length of the Spinozistic position which, in effect, he adopts. Instead of saying that to be free is to be what one must be, I wish he had said, with Spinoza, that to become free, or to achieve freedom, is to recognize, accept, nay *love*, this "must," which is the evidence of union with the All, *Deus sive Natura*. And as for Nature and consciousness, I should again reverse the method of the argument, and, instead of interpreting consciousness as a minor system in Nature, interpret Nature as one system in, or aspect of, the total world of our experience. Dr. Marshall, *malgré lui*, is in the fetters of Naturalism.

3. Concerning consciousness and self, Dr. Marshall advocates doctrines which the limits of his time compel him to expound and defend with tantalizing brevity. He clings to the distinction of consciousness as mental and behavior as physical, the familiar psychophysical parallelism reappearing as "the hypothesis of a thoroughgoing noetic and neururgic correspondence." In consciousness, elements attended to are distinguished as "presentations" from the "field of inattention," which latter Dr. Marshall identifies with the *self*. It follows that the self of any one moment is neither presented nor presentable. In self-consciousness, no doubt, we have a presented self, but this presentation is either the "image" of a past self or the "simulacrum" of the moment's real self. In either case, the presentation, or "empirical ego," is sufficiently like the unrepresentable original, to make it possible for us to study the latter "by indirection" through its reflections in the former. Dr. Marshall is skating here over very thin ice, as every student of this problem of self-introspection will recognize. It would have been well if he had found time to discuss how to distinguish the presentation which is my empirical self from my other presentations, or how we can be sure that this presented ego is a sufficiently faithful likeness of the unrepresented self to justify the description of the latter as "that undifferentiable mass of unemphatic elements within the whole of consciousness." It is to be noted in this connection that Dr. Marshall himself claims that the empirical ego changes so little from moment to moment as to beget the illusion of the unchanging identity of the self, and thus to *mask* the constant mutation of the real self.

4. This mutability of the real self is a fundamental point in Dr. Marshall's argument. He uses it to assert the "creativity" of the self, and, thence, "objective creativity" as a "general characteristic of Nature." At any rate, the self creates ideals of progress, purpose, and good, and in some measure effects their realization in Nature. Again, a creative self is "new and unique" at every moment,

and thence Dr. Marshall infers that all volitional acts are rational acts *at the moment of their occurrence*, and that, consequently, we never do actually err or sin. It is only from the point of view of a later self, in turn new and unique, that, retrospectively, we recognize that we *have* erred or sinned. In short, he sides with Socrates in holding that no one sins or errs willingly, *i.e.*, knowing what he does. This in turn, furnishes a basis for an exceedingly interesting distinction between responsibility, accountability, and guilt. This is, I think, the most original portion of the book, and well worthy of careful study.

In Part III, we may note as helpful the view that morality is a "process of experiment, of adaptive adventure" (p. 184), and that it must needs be exposed to frustrations. But there is a consolation for these. "If we could look upon Nature as a whole, we should see ourselves as elemental parts of it, whose frustrations, as we call them, are merely situations necessary to the continued existence of the organic unity of the whole of Nature" (p. 141). If we could! Happy those upon whom life does not put a strain greater than the faith in this tantalizing "If" is able to sustain.

R. F. ALFRED HOERNLÉ.

DURHAM UNIVERSITY,
ENGLAND.

THE REFORMATION IN IRELAND. HENRY HOLLOWAY. Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge. The Macmillan Co. 1919. Pp. 240. \$2.75.

A work on the Reformation in Ireland might almost rival the brevity of the famous chapter on Irish snakes, if by Reformation be meant any change in the thought and religion of the people. In this sense there was no spiritual revolution in Erin; the cult of the nation remained just the same after Luther that it was before him, only — if a bull may be pardoned in this connection — "more so." One need not draw the parallel with England, so rich in versions of the Bible, in prayer-books and tracts and a great Protestant literature, to be astonished at the barrenness of Irish religion. She produced no great Catholic doctors or saints — no Loyola, no Cajetan, no Neri, no Borromeo, no Canisius, no Xavier. Ireland had already begun to live in and on her past; without seeking fresh acquisitions she eked out her spiritual livelihood from the usufruct of her great age of religion, when Irish monks evangelized the world and Irish scholars disputed with Aquinas the palm of philosophy.

But though there was no Reformation in Ireland, there was a shadow of one, and it is this that Mr. Holloway now traces. It was

the shadow of England. Every great act passed by Henry VIII and his immediate successors relating to religion, was extended to the sister isle. First, the Royal Supremacy was asserted, and in its train followed a swarm of ancillary statutes intended to enforce it. The monasteries were attacked in Erin, as they had been dissolved in Britain. The liturgy was standardized according to the English models; the articles of faith were revised by Anglican canons.

Why then did not the people embrace Protestantism? Mr. Holloway's answer is that the government was insincere in its profession of zeal and awkward in the application of means to the avowed end. For example, when Latin was abandoned in the churches, not Erse but English, then understood by only a small minority of the people, was substituted for it. "Such enactments witness that the Government considered it more important to anglicize than to provide for the progress of religion, and the pastors of souls were to be the agents in this policy." The means taken to forward the cause of the gospel were the best way of killing it. The reaction against the superimposed policy was opposite to that desired by the king, and was very great. From this time forth Irishmen clung to Catholicism as one more relic of nationalism, and resented intrusions of English religion as part and parcel of a policy of hateful conquest. Finally, one aspect of the subject suggested by this thorough little book is that of the relation of the government to the changes in English religion. It is sometimes said that the British changed their faith at the beck and call of their rulers. But had it not been for a deep popular undercurrent, would not the efforts of the Tudors have been as futile in London as they were in Dublin?

PRESERVED SMITH.

CAMBRIDGE.

PROPHECY AND AUTHORITY: A STUDY IN THE HISTORY OF THE DOCTRINE AND INTERPRETATION OF SCRIPTURE. KEMPER FULLERTON. The Macmillan Co. 1919. Pp. xxii, 214. \$1.50.

Professor Fullerton's book may be most warmly commended to all readers, whether lay or clerical, of this Review. It will not be of equal value to all. Scholars, and readers who have accepted without independent investigation modern theories concerning the Bible, may feel that its thesis requires no proof; but the historical course of events is so clearly and pointedly presented that all will find the book interesting and instructive. The early Christian Church accepted the authority of the Old Testament as an inheritance from

Judaism, and also because it was required by the argument from prophecy, which played an important rôle in its apologetic, and with it accepted also contemporary methods of interpretation. But by the same methods, particularly the allegorical, heretics also defended their opinions; hence, with the growing organization of the Church, there developed reliance upon baptismal confessions, councils, apostolic succession, until the full-blown theory of Church authority appeared, which thrust the Scriptures into the background. With the Reformation, however, the Bible again came to the front, and the influence of Humanism favored the rise of a genuinely historical method of exegesis. This was aided also by the necessity of finding clear and explicit Biblical authority for definite doctrine, as against the subjectivism of allegory; but, unhappily, the same reason led to a demand for intellectual consistency in Scriptural teaching, which was fatal to historical interpretation.

The interesting story is traced by means of the clue afforded by the interpretation of prophecy, and the author, bringing his account up to the present time, shows how the premillennial excitement, of which Bishop McConnell wrote in a recent number of this Review, is due to the erroneous conception of prophecy as prediction. Two quotations will indicate the character and conclusions of the book:

"The new view of prophecy does not concentrate its attention upon a series of unconnected predictions whose truth depends upon their minute literal fulfilment, but it looks upon prophecy as a great organic movement in the history of Israel, extending through the centuries, and in its moral power and grandeur presenting a phenomenon absolutely unique in the ancient world, and most easily explicable upon the assumption of a supernatural guidance" (p. 199).

"Just as Jesus fulfilled the Law, not by emphasizing the letter of its observance but by pointing out its wider reach and deeper import, so he fulfilled prophecy, not because he is the fulfiller of prophetic predictions, but because he is the fulfiller of prophetic ideals" (p. 197).

W. W. FENN.

HARVARD UNIVERSITY.

THE BEGINNINGS OF CHRISTIANITY. Part I. The Acts of the Apostles. Edited by F. J. FOAKES JACKSON and KIRSOPP LAKE. Vol. I. Prolegomena I. The Jewish, Gentile, and Christian Backgrounds. The Macmillan Co. 1920. Pp. xii, 480. 18s.

This is the first volume of a monumental work in three volumes to be issued in continuation of Bishop Lightfoot's great series on the Pauline Epistles and later Christian literature, in which he combined commentary with historic criticism. Of the two volumes which are to follow in the present series, the first will deal with the literary criticism of the Acts, its authorship, sources, grammar, its character as history. The second — the third volume of the series — will contain the text of the Acts and a commentary. The editors have not merely edited papers prepared by others, but have themselves written most of the book. But they include a chapter on the Spirit of Judaism by C. G. Montefiore, one on the Roman Provincial System by H. T. F. Duckworth, and one on Life in the Roman Empire at the Beginning of the Christian Era by Clifford H. Moore. The subjects treated by the editors are the Background of Jewish History; Varieties of Thought and Practice in Judaism; the Dispersion; the Public Teaching of Jesus and his Choice of the Twelve; the Disciples in Jerusalem and the Rise of Gentile Christianity; the Development of Thought on the Spirit, the Church, and Baptism; and Christology. Of the five Appendices two are by Professor G. F. Moore on Nazarene and Nazareth, and the People of the Land. There are two maps and two excellent indexes.

No one hereafter can have a critical opinion in regard to the Acts which does not take account of this book. Not that it in any way claims to be the last word on the subject. The scholarly editors are far too scholarly to make such an assumption. Their pages, they say, (p. 417) "are designed to assist the attempt rightly to understand the development of thought and practice which produced the Christian Church of the middle of the first century. They are intended not as a finished picture of every element in it, but of those which certainly formed part of the stream of thought to which the writer of Acts belonged. That there were other elements in other streams is proved by the survival of the Pauline Epistles."

The book is divided into three parts. The first part — The Jewish World — in its first section does not avoid that difficulty of tending to become a catalogue which handicaps every attempt to condense much history into small space. But the general effect of the wide range of knowledge shown and the constructiveness employing it, is to create for the reader a world which is vital, rational, and

therefore real. The second part — The Gentile World — is naturally briefer than the others; though one could wish that even fuller treatment had been given to the oriental religions and their influence on Christianity. But limitations of space, like charity, must always cover a multitude of omissions.

The third part — Primitive Christianity — is the most important section of the book. It endeavors to analyze the contributions of this and that redactor of the early sources, to discover the genuine utterances of Jesus, to lay bare the historical fact underlying the accretions in our accounts, to reconstruct thus a complete organism, as it were, from a fossil or a bone. This is necessarily to some extent a matter of subjective criticism; to which, as the editors warn us, "it is a mistake to attribute a so-called objective value" (p. 268). This careful study of details often has a scrappy effect; more attention being given to reconstructing a fact than to showing its value when reconstructed. The style therefore of these parts is heavy; the bricks for the building are shot at the reader with little artistry, and the construction — even of a sentence (p. 159, l. 14) — is left to him. Yet the mass of profound learning which the book throughout contains is not without the exhibition of its relation to life. The section by the editors on the Apocalyptic Thought and Literature gives a full and vivid picture of a remarkable literary movement.

The chapter by Professor C. H. Moore — Life in the Roman Empire at the Beginning of the Christian Era — is noteworthy on account not only of its mastery of the subject but also of its style. It has definite construction, clearness and felicity of expression; it marches surely and swiftly, and is full of imaginative insight. Many such excellences appear also in the chapter by C. G. Montefiore on the Spirit of Judaism. This contains the most beautiful passage in the book (p. 60); where the writer, himself a Jew, answers the objection that the observance of the many details of the Law must be burdensome. Such observances he likens to the customs of a loving family, which carry with them a joy in compliance. "To lovers every order of the Beloved is dear. . . . The joy is in the Law, and even in the performance of the most trifling Misvoth."

The make-up of the book shows great inconsistency in typographical usage. Thus book titles are sometimes in italic (pp. 119, 233, 318, 355), sometimes in roman (pp. 56, 128, 354); sometimes with quotation marks, sometimes without (pp. 92, 354). The same word is used both with and without quotation marks — "the Seven" (p. 308); "Luke" (pp. 302, 303). Double quotation marks and single are employed without distinction of function (pp. 47, 269, 365).

The colon is used, not, as in the best American usage, to anticipate the explanation of a previous statement, but without difference from a semicolon (pp. 325, 326). Capitals appear, as in "Age to Come" (pp. 277, 278), yet the same word has elsewhere lower case (pp. 342, 365). Foreign words in English letters are sometimes in italic (pp. 69, 79), sometimes in roman (pp. 230, 424). The proof-reading is often defective (p. 106, l. 18; p. 174, l. 17; p. 320, l. 10; p. 323, l. 25; p. 339, l. 3). But quite apart from its dress the book marks a most important stage in the critical study of the New Testament.

FREDERIC PALMER.

HARVARD UNIVERSITY.

BOOKS OF SERMONS:

ADDRESSES AND SERMONS TO STUDENTS. DAVID M. STEELE. G. P. Putnam's Sons. 1919. Pp. 257. \$1.25.

CITIZENS OF TWO WORLDS AND OTHER SERMONS. C. B. WILLIAMS. Fleming H. Revell Co. 1919. Pp. 214. \$1.25.

THE BREATH IN THE WINDS, AND OTHER SERMONS. FREDERICK F. SHANNON. Fleming H. Revell Co. 1918. Pp. 173. \$1.00.

THE SWORD OF THE SPIRIT: BRITAIN AND AMERICA IN THE GREAT WAR. JOSEPH FORT NEWTON. George H. Doran Co. Pp. 241. \$1.50.

YALE TALKS. CHARLES REYNOLDS BROWN. Yale University Press. 1919. Pp. 156. \$1.00.

WHAT THE WAR HAS TAUGHT US. CHARLES EDWARD JEFFERSON. Fleming H. Revell Co. 1919. Pp. 258. \$1.50.

Here are several recent volumes of sermons varying greatly both in type and excellence.

The rector of the Church of St. Luke and the Epiphany in Philadelphia has brought together a number of Commencement orations and baccalaureate sermons delivered to students in institutions varying from a girls' boarding-school to the University of Pennsylvania. It is easy to understand why he should be in demand for such occasions. He is breezy and outspoken, provocative in his love of epigram, and not too profound in his thought to enable the young ladies to follow him readily. His sermon on "The Privilege of the Strong" to Bryn Mawr students, and on "The Chemistry of Souls" to the graduating class of the Philadelphia College of Pharmacy, are excellent examples of popular preaching adapted to special occasions. His address on "Why is a Seminary?" to the alumni of the Philadelphia

Divinity School, with its pointed and not altogether just criticism of theological education, illustrates his somewhat Chestertonian quality. But when, in a later address, we find him referring to "the *Imitatione de Christi*," and classing "the rhapsodies of Benvenuto Cellini" with the *Confessions of St. Augustine* as devotional literature, one wonders less at his complaint that he feels that his own Alma Mater did not do all she might for him.

Dean Williams of the Southwestern Baptist Seminary at Fort Worth presents what is really rather a series of sermon outlines than a volume of finished addresses. In many instances they are running commentaries on Scripture passages, with frequent references to war-time duties of Americans thrown in. They read as though they had been taken down stenographically and had been printed without sufficient revision. It is difficult to explain otherwise how an undoubtedly orthodox Dean of a theological seminary could make the following slip: "So the whole triune God is committed, in their (*sic*) infinite resources, to the preservation and security of the believer."

Very different in quality is Dr. Shannon's volume. Here is a vigorous preacher, who uses a noble style to deal with great themes. He is a writer of marked individuality, and his thought flows broad and deep between borders made rich and lovely by apt illustration. His sermons read so well that one wonders how they sounded — whether they flew low enough to the ground for his hearers. However that may be, they are delightful and stimulating reading.

Dr. Newton made his reputation as a preacher in Iowa before he was called to be the American minister of the City Temple in London. In the present volume he has printed a collection of sermons delivered in London during the Great War. They are words of courage and of consolation, free from bitterness and hate, looking through the gloom of the war to the brighter days beyond. If he has something less of literary quality than Dr. Shannon, he has perhaps more directness of appeal, more immediate application to the occasion. It is good to know that a sermon like his on "England and America" was preached in London in 1918. But there is little to choose among them, for all alike are the words of a straightforward, undogmatic preacher, whose feet know the common ways of life but whose eyes are lifted to the eternal hills.

"Talks" is an accurate title for the little volume of addresses delivered in Battell Chapel at Yale by Dean Charles R. Brown, of the

Yale School of Religion. They are brief, direct, pithy sometimes to the verge of slang, well calculated to hold the attention of young men not too much given to close thinking about sacred themes but ready enough to listen to practical, stimulating, sagacious advice about clean and honorable living. For there is, in these talks, genuine power and a burning moral passion which kindles the reader. But one wonders if it is no longer possible, even in our University chapels, for the preacher to deal with the profounder intellectual aspects of the religious life. In such institutions, if anywhere, there ought still to be a hearing for the sermon which seeks to go to the root of our ethical problems and of our intellectual questions regarding faith and life.

We could wish with all our hearts that the world had really learned "What the War has Taught Us," as expounded by Dr. Charles E. Jefferson of the Broadway Tabernacle. But these discourses, though delivered only a short time ago, speak of truths already half forgotten. The war did indeed teach us afresh "the meaning of sacrifice," "the might of the spirit," "the progressive brutality of war," and many other things set forth in the volume with vigor and a considerable measure of insight. But we have already experienced a considerable "slump" in our idealism, perhaps because humility was not one of the things we learned, perhaps because America actually suffered so little and realized in so small measure what the war really meant to Europe. The theme of the volume is one which many a preacher might use to advantage in keeping before his people the moral and spiritual lessons which they are prone speedily to forget.

HENRY WILDER FOOTE.

HARVARD UNIVERSITY.

BOOKS RECEIVED

BOOKS RECEIVED

- THE SEVENTH SEAL. *By Jeanette Agnes.* John C. Winston Co. 1920. Pp. 177. \$1.25.
- THE MYTHOLOGY OF ALL RACES. *By Hartley B. Alexander.* (L. H. Gray and G. F. Moore, eds.) Vol. XI, Latin-American. Marshall Jones Co. 1920. Pp. xvi, 424.
- THE AMERICAN RED CROSS IN THE GREAT WAR. *By Henry P. Davison.* The Macmillan Co. Pp. x, 302. \$2.00.
- ETHICS, GENERAL AND SPECIAL. *By Owen A. Hill.* The Macmillan Co. 1920. Pp. xiv, 414. \$3.50.
- JESUS' PRINCIPLES OF LIVING. *By Charles F. Kent and Jeremiah W. Jenks.* Charles Scribner's Sons. 1920. Pp. viii, 149. \$1.25.
- LE TEXTE ARMÉNIEN DE L'ÉVANGILE D'APRÈS MATTHIEU ET MARC (Annales du Musée Guimet). *By Frédéric Macler.* Imprimerie Nationale. Paris, 1919. Pp. lxxii, 649.
- WEST AND EAST. THE EXPANSION OF CHRISTENDOM AND THE NATURALIZATION OF CHRISTIANITY IN THE ORIENT IN THE SIXTH CENTURY. (The Dale Lectures, 1913.) *By Edward C. Moore.* Charles Scribner's Sons. 1920. Pp. 421. \$4.00.
- LECTURES ON MODERN IDEALISM. With an Introduction by Jacob Loewenberg. *By Josiah Royce.* Yale University Press. 1919. Pp. xii, 266. \$3.00.
- LITTLE ESSAYS DRAWN FROM THE WRITINGS OF GEORGE SANTAYANA. *By George Santayana.* (L. P. Smith, ed.) Charles Scribner's Sons. 1920. Pp. xii, 290. \$3.00.
- CONTRIBUTIONS TOWARD A HISTORY OF ARABICO-GOTHIC CULTURE. *By Leo Wiener.* Vol. II. The Neale Publishing Co. New York, 1919. Pp. xii, 400.

Andover Theological Seminary

Cambridge, Massachusetts

AFFILIATED WITH HARVARD UNIVERSITY

A professional training-school for Christian Ministers, with a three years' course of study leading to the degree of Bachelor of Divinity. Courses in all departments of Theology, with liberal privilege of election. Students have access to courses offered by the Harvard Divinity Faculty and by the Faculty of Arts and Sciences.

For Catalogues and information apply to

THE PRESIDENT OF THE FACULTY,
CAMBRIDGE, MASS.

Divinity School of Harvard University

An undenominational School of Theology, offering a three years' (elective) course of study for the degree of Bachelor of Divinity, and special advantages to qualified students wishing to pursue courses of graduate study in particular departments of theology.

FACULTY

ABBOTT LAWRENCE LOWELL, LL.B., LL.D., Ph.D., PRESIDENT.

WILLIAM WALLACE FENN, A.M., D.D., DEAN, and *Bussey Professor of Theology*.

FREDERIC PALMER, A.M., D.D., *Managing Editor of the Harvard Theological Review*.

GEORGE FOOT MOORE, A.M., D.D., LL.D., Litt.D., *Frothingham Professor of the History of Religion*.

DAVID GORDON LYON, Ph.D., D.D., *Hancock Professor of Hebrew and other Oriental Languages, and Curator of the Semitic Museum*.

EDWARD CALDWELL MOORE, Ph.D., D.D., *Parkman Professor of Theology, and Plummer Professor of Christian Morals*.

JAMES RICHARD JEWETT, Ph.D., *Professor of Arabic*.

IRVAH LESTER WINTER, A.B., *Associate Professor of Public Speaking*.

JAMES HARDY ROPES, A.B., D.D., *Hollis Professor of Divinity, and Dexter Lecturer on Biblical Literature*.

KIRSOPP LAKE, A.M., D.D., *Winn Professor of Ecclesiastical History*.

HENRY WILDER FOOTE, A.M., S.T.B., *Assistant Professor of Preaching and Parish Administration, and Secretary of the Faculty*.

JAMES FORD, Ph.D., *Assistant Professor of Social Ethics*.

ROBERT FRANZ FOERSTER, Ph.D., *Assistant Professor of Social Ethics*.

HARRY AUSTRYN WOLFSON, Ph.D., *Instructor in Jewish Literature and Philosophy*.

GEORGE LA PIANA, S.T.M., Ph.D., *Instructor in Church History*.

FRANK STANTON BURNS GAVIN, S.T.M., *Austin Teaching Fellow*.

OWEN HAMILTON GATES, Ph.D., *Librarian of the Andover-Harvard Theological Library*.

ARCHIBALD THOMPSON DAVISON, Ph.D., *Director of Music*.

Students registered in the Divinity School have the privilege of attending without extra charge courses offered by the Harvard Faculty of Arts and Sciences, by the Faculty of Andover Theological Seminary, and by the Faculty of the Episcopal Theological School, Cambridge.

Further information will be furnished on application to the Dean of the School.

OPEN COURT BOOKS ARE LONG-LIVED

The Early Mathematical Manuscripts of Leibniz

Published by CARL IMMANUEL GERHARDT. Translated from the Latin Texts with Critical and Historical Notes by J. M. CHILD.

Cloth, \$1.50

An Ethical System Based on the Laws of Nature

By M. DESHUMBERT. Translated from the French by LIONEL GILES, M.A. This book has already appeared in seven different languages, and will shortly appear in three others.

Pages 231. *Paper Edition, 75c*

Saccheri's Euclides Vindicatus

Edited and translated by GEORGE BRUCE HALSTED. Latin-English Edition of the first non-Euclidean Geometry published in Milan, 1733. Pages 280.

Cloth, \$2.00

Rival Philosophies of Jesus and Paul

By IGNATIUS SINGER. The author's contention is that there are two distinct and mutually destructive philosophies in the Gospels, one by Jesus and one by Paul.

Cloth, \$2.00

The Elements of Non-Euclidean Geometry

By D. M. Y. SOMMERVILLE, M.A. "An excellent text-book for teachers of geometry who wish to understand the position in which Euclid's parallel-postulate has been placed by modern thought." — *Journal of Education*.

Cloth, \$2.00

Letters to Teachers

By HARTLEY B. ALEXANDER, University of Nebraska. A collection of papers addressed to all who realize the importance of a critical reconstruction of public education in America.

Cloth, \$1.25

Education in Ancient Israel

By FLETCHER H. SWIFT, University of Minnesota. This book is the first attempt in English to give a full account of the debt which Christendom owes to Judaism for its religious and educational conceptions, standards and ideals.

Cloth, \$1.25

Anatole France

By LEWIS PIAGET SHANKS, Assistant Professor of Romance Languages and Literatures in the University of Wisconsin. "Best book on the greatest living writer of today." — *The Nation*.

Cloth, \$1.50

The Open Court Publishing Co.

122 SOUTH MICHIGAN AVENUE

CHICAGO, ILL.

Publishers of educational and scientific books. Send for catalogue.

PUBLICATIONS OF BIBLIOTHECA SACRA CO.

By MELVIN GROVE KYLE

The Deciding Voice of the Monuments in Biblical Criticism. 325 pages. 8vo, cloth, \$1.65, postpaid.

Moses and the Monuments. 300 pages. 8vo, cloth, \$2.15, postpaid.

The Problem of the Pentateuch. [*In press.*] 300 pages. 8vo, cloth, \$2.15, postpaid.

By HAROLD M. WIENER

Essays in Pentateuchal Criticism. 255 pages. 8vo, cloth, \$1.50, postpaid.

Pentateuchal Studies. 350 pages. 8vo, cloth, \$2.00, postpaid.

The Origin of the Pentateuch. 150 pages. 8vo, paper, 40 cents, postpaid.

By G. FREDERICK WRIGHT

Scientific Confirmations of Old Testament History. 450 pages. 12mo, cloth, \$2.00, postpaid.

Origin and Antiquity of Man. 500 pages. 12mo, \$2.00, postpaid.

The Ice Age in North America and Its Bearings on the Antiquity of Man. Sixth Edition. 808 pages. 8vo, cloth, \$6.00, postpaid.

Story of My Life and Work. 476 pages. 12mo, cloth, \$2.00, postpaid.

BIBLIOTHECA SACRA

G. FREDERICK WRIGHT, *Editor*

CONTENTS OF JULY, 1920

The Temptations in the Wilderness. ALBERT WESTON MOORE.

The Finality of Christianity. WILLIAM HALLOCK JOHNSON.

Education Versus Enlightenment. CHARLES SUPER.

Contributions to a New Theory of the Composition of the Pentateuch (IV). HAROLD M. WIENER.

Critical Notes — Unitarianism in America, Past and Present; Professor Barton on "The Religion of Moses"; Criticism of John Robinson by a Friend.

July and October, 1920, Gratis to New Subscribers
sending \$3.00 for 1921

BIBLIOTHECA SACRA COMPANY

OBERLIN : : : : : OHIO

MILTON SAID IT

"A good book is the precious life-blood of a master spirit, embalmed and treasured up on purpose to a life beyond life."

THESE ARE GOOD BOOKS

THE REVELATION OF JOHN. By SHIRLEY J. CASE. \$2.75, postpaid \$2.90. The central idea of the book is to explain the meaning of Revelation as its author intended it to be understood by those to whom it was first addressed. The volume has been prepared especially to meet the needs of the preacher and the layman who desire a popular rather than a highly technical treatment of the subject.

THE NEW ORTHODOXY. By EDWARD S. AMES. \$1.25, postpaid \$1.35. Presents in simple terms a view of religion consistent with the mental habits of those trained in the sciences, in the professions, and in the expert direction of practical affairs. Every person dissatisfied with the scholastic faith of traditional Protestantism will find this volume exceedingly helpful.

SOME RELIGIOUS IMPLICATIONS OF PRAGMATISM. By JOSEPH R. GEIGER. Paper, 50 cents, postpaid 53 cents. This study is concerned with the religious problem as it has come to be formulated in the history of modern thought. Dr. Geiger says that if pragmatism is to prove fruitful and suggestive for the interpretation of religious realities and for the criticism and evaluation of religious knowledge and truth, this must be by reason of its general doctrines concerning reality, knowledge, and truth.

WILLIAM JAMES AND HENRI BERGSON. By HORACE M. KALLEN. \$1.50, postpaid \$1.65. This volume is a study in philosophic contrasts. It points out how William James and Henri Bergson, although showing certain general tendencies of thought, formulated divergent, and in some respects antagonistic, theories of life and fate.

THE RELATION BETWEEN RELIGION AND SCIENCE: A BIOLOGICAL APPROACH. By ANGUS S. WOODBURN. Paper, 75 cents, postpaid 85 cents. The author has shown that religion and science may exist side by side in cordial relationships where the specific functions of each are recognized.

THE SPREAD OF CHRISTIANITY IN THE MODERN WORLD. By EDWARD C. MOORE. \$2.00, postpaid \$2.15. This book gives a survey of missions since the beginning of the modern era, about 1775 A.D., and depicts the missionary movement against the background of general history.

A GUIDE TO THE STUDY OF THE CHRISTIAN RELIGION. Edited by GERALD B. SMITH. \$3.00, postpaid \$3.20. An up-to-date comprehensive survey, by twelve well-known scholars, of progress in the new scholarship of the past twenty-five years, in its relation to the Bible and theology.

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO PRESS

5851 ELLIS AVENUE

CHICAGO, ILLINOIS

Books of Permanent Value

THE RELIGIOUS HISTORY OF NEW ENGLAND

By JOHN W. PLATNER, W. W. FENN, and others \$2.75

Essays on the Congregationalists, Unitarians, Baptists, Quakers, Episcopalians, Methodists, Universalists, and Swedenborgians, each by an acknowledged leader.

"A book of first rate importance to the student of American Christianity." — *Union Seminary Review*. "This fascinating volume." — *Contemporary Review* (London).

STRIFE OF SYSTEMS AND PRODUCTIVE DUALITY

By WILMON H. SHELDON, of Dartmouth College \$3.50

"A distinct achievement. . . . The volume offers an admirably sympathetic and accurate cross section of the deposit of the entire philosophic tradition. . . . It is a very substantial and much needed achievement to have given the careful exposition of Natorp's, Münsterberg's, and Baldwin's systems, to have given a fine portrayal and interpretation of the Thomistic synthesis, to have subjected 'Great Objectivism' to a remarkably clear and acute analysis and criticism, and everywhere to see into the motives, the difficulties, and the deeper points of contact between the major types of philosophic thinking." — GEORGE P. ADAMS, in *The Philosophical Review*.

THE SELF AND NATURE

By DEWITT H. PARKER, of the University of Michigan \$2.00

"It is independently thought out, and well abreast of the speculations of modern thinkers; and its own attitude to the riddle of the universe is an encouraging one, since its teaching discredits pessimism as an intelligible disillusion, and lays it down that 'all the fundamental values of human existence remain intact.'" — *The Scotsman* (Edinburgh).

THE ORDER OF NATURE

By LAWRENCE J. HENDERSON, of Harvard University \$1.50

"I am struck with its thoroughness and thoughtfulness, and regard it as of unusual significance and value to all earnest students of the theology of nature." — J. W. BUCKHAM, Pacific Theological Seminary, Berkeley, California.

HARVARD THEOLOGICAL STUDIES

Edited by GEORGE FOOT MOORE, JAMES HARDY ROPES, and KIRSOPP LAKE.

- I. COMPOSITION AND DATE OF ACTS. By C. C. TORREY. \$1.00.
- II. PAULINE IDEA OF FAITH. By W. H. P. HATCH. \$1.25.
- III. EPHOD AND ARK. By WILLIAM R. ARNOLD. \$1.75.
- IV. GOSPEL MSS. OF THE GENERAL THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY. By C. C. EDMUNDS and W. H. P. HATCH. \$1.25.
- V. MACARII ANECDOTA. Edited by G. E. MARRIOTT. \$1.25.
- VI. STYLE AND LITERARY METHOD OF LUKE. By H. J. CADBURY. \$3.00.
- VII. IS MARK A ROMAN GOSPEL? By B. W. BACON. \$1.25.
- VIII. THE DEFENSOR PACIS OF MARSIGLIO OF PADUA. By EPHRAIM EMERTON. \$1.25.

HARVARD UNIVERSITY PRESS

42 Randall Hall
Cambridge 38, Mass.

280 Madison Avenue, at 40th Street
New York City